

JPRS-TAC-87-050

31 JULY 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

31 JULY 1987

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Briefing 2 July (Various sources, 2 Jul 87)	1
U.S. Creates Arms 'Obstacles'	1
Discusses Weapons, ABM Treaty	1
Denies Reaching Arms Agreement	2
AFP on Denial	2
TASS Accuses U.S. of Impeding Progress (Moscow TASS International Service, 3 Jul 87)	4

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Budapest TV Interviews USSR's Petrovskiy (Alajos Chrudinak; Budapest Television Service, 11 Jun 87)	5
USSR: Rogers, Carrington 'Afraid' of Disarmament Race (Stanislav Kondrashov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 25 Jun 87)	7
PRAVDA on Reasons for Opposition to Zero Option (Vladislav Drobkov; Moscow PRAVDA, 28 Jun 87)	10
PRAVDA Cites U.S. Spokesman Oakley on Pershings (Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Jun 87)	13
Moscow on 'Incompatible Tendencies' in NATO (Moscow World Service, 29 Jun 87)	15

Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Briefing 3 July (Moscow TASS, 3 Jul 87)	16
Moscow Talk Show Views State of Negotiations (Andrey Ptashnikov; Moscow Domestic Service, 3 Jul 87)	17
Soviet Colonel: U.S., FRG 'Creating Obstacles' (V. Nazarenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 4 Jul 87)	21
PRAVDA Questions Upbeat View of Arms Talks (Yevgeniy Grigoryev; Moscow PRAVDA, 6 Jul 87)	24
TASS: Soviet Reaction to Kohl's 4 June Statement (Moscow TASS International Service, 4 Jun 87; Moscow TASS, 5 Jun 87)	26
'Opponent of Nuclear-Free Europe'	26
'Leads Attack on Nuclear Disarmament'	26
TASS Analyst on Kohl 23 June INF Statement (Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 87)	28
Soviet Media Hit French-FRG Talks on Military Cooperation (Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 24 Jun 87; Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jun 87)	30
'Playing With Fire'	30
'French Nuclear Umbrella', by Yuriy Zhukov	31
FRG's Genscher Discusses Missiles in Moscow (Moscow TASS International Service, 7 Jul 87)	33
USSR: KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Assesses Status of Tomahawk Missiles (F. Gontar; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Jun 87)	34
France's Prime Minister Interviewed on Disarmament (Jacques Chirac Interview; Bonn DIE WELT, 29 Jun 87)	37
Thatcher Vows Independent Nuclear Deterrence for UK (David Millward; London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 11 Jun 87)	38
Yugoslav Monthly Interviews GDR Foreign Minister (Belgrade TANJUG, 1 Jul 87)	39

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR Military Evaluation: NATO Stance at Vienna Consultations (Editorial; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 12 Jun 87)	40
TASS Examines Reaction to 'Jaruzelski Plan' (Moscow TASS, 2 Jun 87)	43

TASS Hits Rogers Comments on European Conventional Balance (Moscow TASS, 27 Jun 87)	45
Briefs	
NATO-Pact Meeting 29 June	46
Pact Deputy Ministers Meet	46
NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR: Anniversary of Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (Moscow TASS, 25 May 87; Moscow PRAVDA, 28 May 87)	47
No U.S. 'Political Will'	47
U.S. 'Ruses' Obstruct Total Ban, by S. Nikolayev	48
TASS Reports on U.S. Nuclear Tests in Nevada (Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jun 87; Moscow TASS, 30 Jun 87)	50
18 June Test	50
30 June Test	50
French Defense Aides Deny U.S. Nuclear Test Offer (Paris LE MONDE, 23 Jun 87)	51
USSR: Shultz Visits Southeast Asia, Opposes Regional NFZ (Various sources, 17, 19 Jun 87)	52
Talks in Manila	52
Plans To Press ASEAN, by Vitaliy Ilyashenko	52
PRAVDA Commentary, by Aleksandr Serbin	53
Moscow TV on New Zealand Nuclear-Free Declaration (Moscow Television Service, 5 Jun 87)	55
Briefs	
TASS Notes Mururoa Test	56
Semipalatinsk Military Test	56
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR: World Women's Congress Against Nuclear Arms in Moscow (Various sources, 23, 24 Jun 87)	57
Congress Opens	57
Opening Speakers Cited	58
Gorbachev Addresses Congress	58
USSR's Petrovskiy Addresses UN Institute Conference on Security (Moscow TASS, 10 Jun 87)	64

USSR Foreign Ministry Press Conference 11 June (Various sources, various dates)	66
Publication of Disarmament Yearbook	66
Questions-Answer Session, by A. Kuvshinnikov	66
Military Doctrine Discussed	69
New Soviet Book on Disarmament Issues Published (Moscow TASS, 18 Jun 87)	71
Perez de Cuellar Visits Moscow (Various sources, various dates)	73
Meets Gorbachev	73
Meets Officials, Receives Medal	76
Presents Medal to Gromyko	78
Receives Moscow University Degree	78
Attends Dinner, Speaks	79
Addresses TV Audience, by Javier Perez de Cuellar	81
Talks With Shevardnadze	82
Meets With Ryzhkov	84
Holds News Conference	85
Ends Moscow Visit	86
USSR's Shevardnadze Discusses Arms Issues in Bulgaria (Moscow Domestic Service, 14 Jun 87; Moscow TASS, 15 Jun 87)	87
Pact Initiatives	87
Talks With Foreign Minister	88
Shevardnadze Criticizes NATO	88
Mladenov on Warsaw Pact	89
USSR's Shevardnadze Discusses Arms Issues in Hungary (Various sources, various dates)	91
Talks With Foreign Minister	91
Varkonyi Speech at Dinner	92
Shevardnadze Dinner Speech	93
Talks With Kadar	95
Shevardnadze News Conference	96
MTI on News Conference	97
Budapest TV Interview, Eduard Shevardnadze Interview	99
USSR's Shevardnadze Discusses Arms Issues in Yugoslavia (Various sources, various dates)	101
Report on Dizdarevic Speech	101
Shevardnadze Speech	101
Talks With Mojsov	102
TANJUG Interview	103

East German Delegation Discusses Arms Issues in Moscow (Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Jun 87; East Berlin ADN International Service, 23 Jun 87)	106
TASS Report on Talks	106
ADN Report on Talks	107
USSR's Shevardnadze Receives Greek Envoy, Message (Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 87)	109
USSR: Further on Debate Over Deterrence Doctrine (Ales Adamovich; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 19, 6 May 87)	110
Soviet Army Political Chief Decries 'Undertones of Pacificism' (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 29 May 87)	113
PRAVDA Rebuts Claims of Survivability of Nuclear War (G. Vasilyev; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Jun 87)	114

/9986

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS BRIEFING 2 JULY

U.S. Creates Arms 'Obstacles'

LD021414 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 2 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- Washington has been striving lately to create an optimistic picture of the situation at the Geneva talks, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Boris Pyadyshev told a briefing here today.

At various levels, including the leadership of the State Department and the White House, he said, there was being created a baselessly radiant picture of developments at the talks, a picture that in fact distorted the state of affairs in Geneva.

"Why? I think it is not hard to guess. As the true solution of problems, above all on medium-range missiles, was approaching, the American delegation was advancing ever new conditions creating extra obstacles in the way of onward movement," said the Soviet representative.

Discusses Weapons, ABM Treaty

LD021353 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 2 Jul 87

[Text] Briefing at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS) -- The closer the possibility of a decision on nuclear and space weapons, the more the U.S. side invents obstacles that keep the talks idling, Boris Pyadyshev, spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has stated. He addressed a briefing today for journalists.

As for medium-range missiles, he noted, the Soviet Union has put forward the idea of a double zero option in Europe in medium-range and operational and tactical missiles. The United States gave its consent to this, but at the moment they are undertaking bypass maneuver: They are insisting that the U.S. nuclear warheads intended for the operational and tactical missiles in the FRG be kept. The United States is moving things toward bringing about a zero on the side of the Soviet Union and allowing a fairly hefty nuclear arsenal to remain on the U.S. side.

As to the 50-percent cut in strategic offensive armaments, it sometimes comes to the absurd. The principle of counting missile warheads according to the number carried by a missile of the given class during the testing has long since asserted itself in the Soviet-U.S. accords. Now the U.S. side has offered a new and an absolutely arbitrary method of counting warheads. Its use makes it possible to surmise that the Soviet missiles have many more warheads than are actually deployed, and to underestimate the real number of nuclear charges on the U.S. missiles considerably.

Let us turn to the issue of space and adherence to the ABM Treaty. Instead of the 10-year period of strict adherence to the ABM Treaty which was the point in Reykjavik, at present the United States is speaking only of a period of 7 years, and actually speaking not of adhering to the ABM Treaty, but of preparing for its abolishment. It is being proposed to the Soviet Union as a "compromise" that it consider the possibility of walking out of such an accord if it does not suit it, but only when the Soviet Union has already implemented a 50-percent cut in its strategic offensive armaments, and at just implemented it, but on U.S. conditions, which would be detrimental to the interests of the security of the Soviet side, spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said.

Denies Reaching Arms Agreement

LD021334 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 2 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. has denied a report sent out by Western radio stations and wire services this morning to the effect that Col.-Gen. Nikolay Chervov, head of a department of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, and U.S. representative Maynard Glitman allegedly reached understanding on some compromise version of an agreement on medium-range missiles.

Speaking at a briefing today, Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., said that "there is no understanding of any kind between Chervov and the American representative."

AFP on Denial

AU021313 Paris AFP in English 1303 GMT 2 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, July 2 (AFP) -- A Soviet official spokesman Thursday denied reports that the United States and Soviet Union had reached an understanding on the complete elimination of intermediate nuclear missiles, saying that negotiations were deadlocked in Geneva because of U.S. demands. At a press briefing, Foreign Ministry deputy spokesman Boris Pyadyshev also refused to discuss a date for a meeting of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze in Washington. His pessimistic remarks contrasted with reports from Washington, where July 13 had already been advanced as a date for the foreign ministers' talks.

On the reported Soviet concessions to agree to eliminate all its SS-20 missiles in an intermediate missile (INF) agreement, including 100 warheads which were to have been retained in Asia under a plan agreed at the Reykhavik summit, Mr. Pyadyshev said "no proposals of such kind" had been presented at the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks.

Alluding to "western telegraph agencies and radio" reports concerning the proposal by General Nikolay Chervov, in charge of arms control at the Soviet general staff, to Maynard Glitman, responsible for INF at Geneva, Mr. Pyadyshev said that the Soviet general "was not authorised" to put forward proposals. Mr. Pyadyshev's remarks followed a denial from Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation to Geneva. Mr. Pyadyshev accused Washington of creating "additional hindrances" at the talks, by insisting on keeping the option of equipping West German Pershing 1A missiles with nuclear warheads, and of changing the calculations of nuclear arsenals which would leave the United States with a superiority.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1570

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR, SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS ACCUSES U.S. OF IMPEDING PROGRESS

LD032234 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1707 GMT 3 Jul 87

[Text] Geneva, 3 Jul (TASS) -- A draft memorandum on an accord relating to an exchange of initial data applying to a draft treaty on medium-range missiles was submitted by the Soviet side to the group dealing with medium-range missiles at the nuclear and space weapons negotiations during the past week. In connection with a Soviet draft protocol presented earlier on procedures regulating the dismantling or destruction of weapons which come within the scope of a treaty, a start was made with regard to compiling a joint draft text of a document.

However, movement in the direction of reaching an accord on the whole range of problems of medium-range missiles, and operational and tactical missiles, is being impeded by new conditions which are constantly being submitted by the U.S. side, and which undoubtedly go against the principle of equal security.

No positive changes are visible, either, in the U.S. approach to the two other highly important issues which are being discussed at the negotiations -- space, and strategic offensive weapons. The U.S. delegation is stubbornly sticking to proposals, the implementation of which would mean the destruction of the ABM Treaty, the spread of the arms race into space, and, in the sphere of strategic offensive weapons, the acquisition of obvious military advantages for the United States.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1570

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BUDAPEST TV INTERVIEWS USSR'S PETROVSKIY

LD120305 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1930 GMT 11 Jun 87

[Interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and Kuwaiti Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs Rashid 'Abd al-'aziz al-Rashid by presenter Alajos Chrudinak, date and place not specified; Petrovskiy speaks in Russian, al-Rashid in Arabic, both with superimposed Hungarian translation; no video available--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Chrudinak] East-West relations were also discussed at the Venice summit. They have not, however, come to a joint position concerning the elimination of Euromissiles. The NATO member-states want to give a joint reply to the Soviet disarmament proposals at their foreign ministerial meeting, which began today in Reykjavik. As you have seen Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy and I discussed many topics in Moscow, [referring to Budapest TV 31 May interview with Petrovskiy] including the specific barriers to the long-awaited agreement, barriers that should be removed in the coming month.

What will be the next step? What does the Soviet Union wish to do in the coming months, bearing in mind the idea that a summit could be held before the end of this year?

[Petrovskiy] On our part, we are ready to work hard on the documents. We put the draft agreement on the negotiating table in Geneva, just as the other side also informed us about its own ideas. We are willing to work on these documents and, as the diplomats put it, the issues on which we have not been able to agree so far have been put into parentheses. It is these that must be solved now. However, this requires an honest approach. There cannot be endeavors by one side to gain one-sided advantage at the expense of the other. Thus, we must not endeavor to cheat each other. The present generation of American diplomats is much too much under the influence of the style of play which regards the complete defeat of the other side as its own gain. I think that this type of thinking has become outdated. In the game characterized by an all-or-nothing mentality, there can be no winner or loser now; the rules of the game have changed in the meantime.

[Chrudinak] Is it possible to bring the positions closer, through compromises? Can these issues be solved?

[Petrovskiy] This should be the viable road on these issues as well. However, at the present time, the impression that we have gained at the negotiations is such that our evaluation is that there are a number of obstacles along the road leading to an agreement.

[Chrudinak] What sort of obstacles?

[Petrovskiy] First of all, we would like to make an immediate start on reducing, in equal proportions, the number of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles. In other words, we would totally eliminate this category of weapons in the next 5 years. However, we must make a simultaneous start on eliminating them. The American side, on the other hand, suggests that in the first half of the next 5-year stage only the number of Soviet missiles should be reduced. This time they would observe how the Soviets are reducing the number of their weapons and the Americans would begin to dismantle their missiles only in the second half of this period. It is perfectly clear that this is not an equal but, I would say, a discriminatory negotiating stance.

I see the other obstacle in the way of an agreement in the fact that the United States is now not putting the emphasis on the elimination of the medium-range means, the Pershings and the cruise missiles, but on turning them into shorter-range missiles. For example, in connection with the Pershings, they say: Let us remove one grade of Pershing missiles, and thereby the Pershing would be turned into a missile which could be discussed together with the conventional weapons. All in all, this is not a serious stance. An American firm has calculated that it would only take a few hours to change this sort of weapon back into the medium-range missile. Even the possibility of these missiles continuing to exist must be excluded. In my opinion, there is also a further, a third, obstacle. This obstacle is the issue of the 100 warheads that would remain. Unfortunately, it is our experience that they are making very many statements concerning these 100 warheads which are aimed at disguising the essence of the matter. Originally it was the idea of the Americans that we not eliminate all the medium-range missiles but leave some of them. In Reykjavik we agreed to this idea, and proposed that 100 warheads should be kept on each side. Now the Americans have said they would deploy the missiles carrying the remaining 100 warheads inside the boundaries of the United States in places from where they could reach Soviet territory. In other words, they would deploy them in Alaska. This is why they are now proclaiming that every country is free to deploy the missiles in its own territory wherever it wishes to. It followed logically that we could also act in the same way. Despite all this, we hope that in the end the United States will adopt a responsible position and will behave in a way which reflects not only a responsible stance but also realism--a realistic appreciation of the situation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1571

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: ROGERS, CARRINGTON 'AFRAID' OF DISARMAMENT RACE

PM261340 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 June 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov article: "Not a Step Further!" under rubric "Political Observer's Notes"]

[Text] For more than 10 years, more than 300,000 U.S. troops have been stationed in Western Europe, primarily in the FRG. The soldiers are commanded by officers, the officers by generals, and, as usual, the generals have their own chief general -- the commander in chief of U.S. troops this side of the Atlantic, who also holds the post of supreme commander NATO Allied Forces Europe.

Bernard Robers has held this post for 8 years, but everything has to end sometime. At the NATO headquarters near Burssels, 26 June will see a changing of the guard and another general, also American, but younger, named John Galvin will step into the shoes of the 65-year-old, four-star general.

Bernard Rogers has not had to fight a war in Europe during his 8 years as supreme commander, thank goodness. But this general of the military-diplomatic corps has never minced his words. And he is not likely to change his tune on the eve of his retirement. In the last few weeks, Rogers has been directing heavy verbal fire not only at his usual targets in Moscow but also, if you can imagine, at his own political command in Washington. What is the problem? What is he unhappy about? For 8 years the general has presided over the European theater with its build-up of U.S. and NATO armed forces. His greatest achievement has been the stationing of American medium-range missiles in Western Europe. But a wrench has been thrown in his works after all. In fact, if an agreement is worked out between Moscow and Washington in Geneva, nothing will remain of these missiles which, according to the general, "can strike any target within 13 minutes and have the greatest possible chance of penetrating Soviet defenses." And another round zero seems to be winking at the general in farewell -- a zero in operational and tactical missiles, which Moscow proposed and which appears to have been digested by Washington, followed by Bonn and other capitals allied to the Americans, although not without difficulty and certain provisos. Two nuclear missile zeros -- if an agreement can be reached -- is the nightmare haunting the supreme commander as he leaves to cross the ocean. He is faced with the question: What has he been fighting for?! Especially as he has had a fleeting glimpse of even more nightmarish prospects beyond these two zeros.

Allow me to quote THE WASHINGTON POST, which managed to tear the general away from packing his suitcases:

"Speaking unusually frankly at the end of his unprecedented 8-year term in NATO, Rogers appealed to this alliance to 'draw the line' after concluding an agreement on medium-range missiles, rejecting any future proposals which would affect other nuclear weapon systems capable of striking Soviet targets. As Rogers said, 'someone must come forward and say to NATO: Enough, to hell with it!' 'We have moved too fast and the time has come to sit down, stop and think, and put our affairs in order' before considering the stream of proposals in the arms control sphere which, Rogers believes, will continue to come from Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev."

So, Bernard Rogers is frankly afraid of the disarmament race. You will probably think the general has gone off his rocker. There is still, alas, no danger of such a race and there is hardly likely to be any in the foreseeable future. The world is still arming. Summing up the results for 1986, in its last yearbook the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute wrote, not without reason, that "successes in the nuclear arms sphere are still considerably ahead of successes in the arms control sphere. "Nevertheless, you cannot deny the general a heightened perception of events, although he has suddenly begun to refer to himself with ironic despair as an "unquestioning infantryman." He is aware there is something in the air -- no, not the danger of a disarmament race but the danger of the first difficult steps along this path. He can see this danger in the "stream of proposals" coming from Moscow and even more in the favorable view taken of this stream of proposals by a very broad section of the public.

The threat of a disarmament race is like a sharp knife to those who are used to participating in quite a different race. The general is not alone in this, of course. Let me remind you that at the end of April, after the visit by Secretary of State Shultz to Moscow, when the prospect of an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe began to dawn more brightly, former President Nixon and his former Secretary of State Kissinger published a joint article for the first time in their lives, warning all strategists, retired and still active: "Any Western leader who encourages the Soviets' perfidious fantasies of a nuclear-free world is threatened with unimaginable dangers." How is that for a statement?! Lord Carrington, NATO general secretary, has spoken equally strongly on the subject: "Gorbachev's proposal to deprive Europe of virtually all its nuclear missiles... represents a terrible challenge to NATO strategists who are primarily concerned by the threat posed by the USSR's vastly superior conventional forces.... If Moscow also proposes the removal of short-range missiles it will be a catastrophe."

Behind these and other preemptive strikes against arms reduction plans, including, incidentally, plans to reduce conventional arms, lurk confusion and perturbation in the face of this new situation. Western strategists are losing control over public opinion in their own countries and are also afraid that the Reagan administration, politically weakened by the "Iran-contra" scandal, is too eager for an agreement with Moscow. It is becoming increasingly difficult to defend the arms race using the old methods, because, seeing the "stream of proposals" from Moscow, more and more people are coming to believe in the Soviet Union's sincerity. Unlike politicians and generals, ordinary people would really prefer a disarmament race -- not just as a dream but as a reality of the immediate future. But the politicians and generals refuse to alter their attitudes and continue to cling to traditional ideas, to say nothing of their material interest in the arms race. Hence, as Comrade Gorbachev said recently, stems the lack of realistic policy in the West, despite the fact that such a policy is dictated by the new possibilities that have opened up. Hence also the quite unusual dilemmas, tasks, fears now being discussed for all to hear.

The arguments used by Michael Evans in the London newspaper THE TIMES are fairly typical. "What happens after the conclusion of a treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces," he writes, "will demonstrate whether the United States and its allies are strong enough and vigilant enough to hold off another siege by Gorbachev.... The 4,000 American nuclear systems remaining in Europe will continue to act as sufficiently weighty evidence that Gorbachev has not succeeded in casting the United States and its European partners adrift from one another. But as soon as an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces is signed, there will be an almost insuperable additional incentive to go further."

I could not have put it better myself. This is what people like Rogers are afraid of: the incentive to go further. As far as they are concerned, progress of this nature is tantamount to retreating and surrendering their positions. And so the last order given by the NATO supreme commander as he quits his post is: Draw the line here! Not a step further!

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA ON REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO ZERO OPTION

PM301517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[Vladislav Drobkov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] If it is correct to say it is possible to see an entire ocean in a small drop, then the past 7 days should quite validly be considered a kind of miniature "copy" of the complex, dramatic, and very promising times in which we live. The events of these days graphically represent the entire spectrum of political, economic, military, cultural, and social life on the planet. They embody the hopes, joys, and sorrows of its inhabitants. If you were to try to find a single common denominator to all these contradictory, ambiguous facts, events, and phenomena, it could probably be only the time they happened -- the last full week in June, the middle of 1987, its "equator," so to say.

Three times during these days the front pages of the world press carried special reports and extensive commentaries with a "Moscow" dateline.

The results of the local soviet elections in our country's union and autonomous republics, published Wednesday, attested to the triumph of socialist democracy and the people's very broad support for the policy of renewal and restructuring.

The World Women's Congress was held successfully in the Soviet capital under the motto "Toward the Year 2000 Without Nuclear Weapons! For Peace, Equality, and Development!"

The CPSU Central Committee plenum, which examined questions of the radical restructuring of economic management, elicited a strong international response. The report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the plenum decisions are now topics of lively discussion both in our country and far beyond its borders.

The past week was also rich in important events in other parts of the world.

An intense struggle continued in the United States and West Europe over the problem of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles.

Our world today has certainly become too fragile and too interdependent and the military might created by man too highly destructive to be able to reckon on resolving the problems facing mankind as an individual or even as a limited elite group -- national or international. [paragraph continues]

to resolve them it is necessary to combine the efforts, will, and reason of all the earth's inhabitants.

About Missiles [subhead]

The justice of this conclusion is well illustrated by the situation regarding the problem of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. Although it is being discussed directly round the negotiating table in Geneva by USSR and U.S. representatives who, incidentally, have made definite progress, other countries and circles are also displaying and declaring an involvement in this problem.

A specific feature of the situation is that everyone (not counting overt militarists) now seems in favor of eliminating missiles. Sober-minded politicians and the broad masses, that is, the undoubted majority of the public, advocate this. But right-wing circles also advocate it verbally. So the watershed can be defined only according to actions. It is here the NATO "hawks" and their political confederates give themselves away. There are torrents of words, but in practice they seek to hamper missile disarmament and to erect cunning obstacles and traps in its path.

In my view, there are several reasons why quite influential forces in the United States and West Europe are still capable of advocating, overtly or covertly, the preservation of a particular part of the U.S. nuclear arsenal in the Old World.

First, the opinion that the defense of West Europe is impossible without the United States -- an opinion skillfully cultivated by NATO -- remains widespread among a certain section of West Europeans. It has been dinned into them over decades that the U.S. nuclear weapons stationed there are a guarantee that, in a crisis, "Uncle Sam" will not abandon his Old World "nephews" to the mercy of fate. Second, some people are still influenced also by the image of the enemy created over decades, the specter of the "Red menace," and so forth. Third, a considerable proportion of West Europeans are still either ill-informed about Soviet proposals and initiatives or judge them from the words of not always conscientious local presenters. True, the wall of silence has begun to collapse in recent months, chiefly thanks to the clarity and intelligibility of the Soviet proposals. But this process is not proceeding all that quickly or everywhere with identical success.

In such a situation opponents of the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles, despite NATO's formal consent to this step, still have sufficient forces, means, and room to maneuver. They take advantage of this. This week several more U.S. and West European politicians, generals, statesmen, and commentators have advanced various provisos, warnings, conditions, and projects aimed at wrecking an accord on missiles.

Even in Geneva itself the U.S. representatives at the missile talks tried to accuse... the USSR of "delaying on accord" on their elimination! The pretext for such a less than appropriate statement was our country's perfectly natural reluctance to tolerate the U.S. proposed maintenance in Europe of 72 U.S. Army-controlled nuclear warheads for the West German Pershing-1A operational and tactical missiles. The U.S. plan to convert the Pershing-2 missile into a shorter-range missile by amputating one of its stages is also clearly aimed at getting round the Soviet Union's clear proposal for the complete elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. Because it is well-known that this stage could be grafted back on in just a few hours. Does NATO really consider us such simpletons?

Be that as it may, the U.S. and NATO maneuvers over the missile problem graphically confirm the existence in the West of an acute deficit of policy for real action and the great dependence of political leaders (above all in the United States) on militarist groupings.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA CITES U.S. SPOKESMAN OAKLEY ON PERSHINGs

PM010925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "They are Still 'Hedging' in Washington"]

[Text] Washington, 26 Jun -- The United States does not intend to eliminate the Pershing-2 medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in the FRG. They merely intend to reequip them as Pershing-1B operational-tactical missiles and hand them over to the FRG. At a briefing for journalists here, U.S. State Department Spokesman Phyllis Oakley has announced these plans of Washington's, which contradict the initial draft of the treaty on medium-range missiles which provides for the elimination of Pershing-2 missiles.

In this connection Oakley stated: "If an agreement is concluded in Geneva on establishing a 'global zero' for short-range missiles (operational-tactical missiles -- TASS), the United States will not have the right to deploy Pershing-1B missiles in Europe. But, long ago we formed a program for cooperation with West Germany within whose framework the United States provides the FRG with Pershing-1 missiles."

It is planned to reequip the Pershing-2 missiles as Pershing-1B missiles by simply dismantling one stage in the medium-range missiles. The reverse buildup of the stage is also a simple operation, with whose aid the United States will be able, at any time, to restore its medium-range missile potential in Europe.

According to Oakley, the FRG Government has still not made the decision to "modernize" existing Pershings. But, she stressed, "the United States agrees with the opinion of the NATO military leadership that the modernization of the Pershings will make it possible to strengthen NATO's nuclear deterrent forces and preserve the flexible response capability" and "will fully support West Germany's modernization decision, if such a decision is made."

Many journalists present at the briefing assessed Oakley's statements as Washington's creation of new obstacles on the path of achieving definitive medium-range missile accords. [paragraph continues]

"As I understand it," one journalist asked, "you are now talking of removing a system which comes under the medium-range missile treaty and turning it into a system which does not come under this treaty, although in terms of range it is entirely subject to being taken into account in the treaty. Is that not a change of position?"

"The point of what M.S. Gorbachev said," Oakley was told by another reporter, "is as follows: Let's have no missiles of this range, let's set a figure of zero for medium-range missiles...but now you are talking of reequipping armaments which come under the medium-range missile treaty and moving them to the sphere of bilateral relations with the FRG so they do not come under the restrictions of the medium-range missile treaty. It seems to me this is a new obstacle created by the United States."

The State Department spokesman could not say anything intelligible in reply.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW ON 'INCOMPATIBLE TENDENCIES' IN NATO

LD300010 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 29 Jun 87

[Text] The problem of the double zero option, that is the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles in Europe by the Soviet Union and the United States, is analyzed by Aleksandr Pogodin. This is what he writes:

There are two incompatible tendencies in the statements on this problem made by American officials and by some of their West European NATO counterparts. On the one hand, some statements proclaim with optimism that now, following the recent session of the NATO Council, all the obstacles have been eliminated and that an agreement might be signed in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, some explanations actually nullify understandings reached on this matter earlier and put to the Soviet Union new conditions that conflict with the principles of equal security.

Not long ago, Western politicians used to say: if the Soviet Union agrees to exclude the problem of medium-range missiles from its Reykjavik package, an agreement based on the zero option will be signed immediately. But as soon as the Soviet Union agreed, the United States and NATO demanded that not only medium-range but also short-range missiles be eliminated. The Soviet Union agreed even to that; that is, to double-zero option. The United States accepted this version in principle, but proceeded, along with some of its NATO allies, to put forward new conditions, linkages and so on. There's an impression that when proclaiming their adherence to a zero option, they did not think about it seriously. Meanwhile, this is a problem of utmost importance. It concerns the vital interests of the USSR and the United States, of the Warsaw Treaty organization and NATO, of all countries and peoples.

An agreement based on the zero option would pose the first real step on the path towards nuclear disarmament. The reaching of a corresponding agreement would open up wide opportunities for resolving many other problems of stopping the arms race, and problems related to disarmament. This historical opportunity should not be missed. The USSR will continue to take concrete steps in the search for a solution to disarmament problems. But, as Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, our partners in the West should also do something instead of inventing more and more demands and testing our patience.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS BRIEFING 3 JULY

LD031007 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 3 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- The USSR sees the U.S. demand for a worldwide elimination of medium-range missiles as an attempt to complicate the situation at Geneva talks, Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

The American side lately has talked much about a global elimination of medium-range missiles, saying, in particular, that a complete destruction of such missiles will make verification easier. One can agree with the latter argument, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said. Once there are no missiles at all, it is easier to verify their absence.

But this is not the main thing. The main thing is that this demand put forward by the American side only recently contradicts the Reykjavik formula. In Reykjavik the Soviet and U.S. leaders have reached agreement that, with medium-range missiles in Europe eliminated altogether, each side will retain 100 warheads on such missiles elsewhere -- the USSR on its Asian territory and the United States on its national territory.

This agreement has been worked out in the course of discussions and exchanges of opinions. It has been based on sound grounds and the American side in Reykjavik has recognized the well-grounded nature of this position of the USSR and agreed with it.

So why is it now that the Soviet Union has made so many compromise steps for reaching agreement on medium-range missiles that the American side is putting forward new demands and new conditions? Objectively speaking, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said, this new demand by the American side hampers progress toward the agreement.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1571

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW VIEWS STATE OF NEGOTIATIONS

LD040016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 3 Jul 87

["International Situation -- Question and Answers" program presented by Andrey Ptashnikov, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio, with Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military matters; Dmitriy Morozov, candidate of historical sciences; and Vladimir Fadeyev, not further identified]

[Excerpts] [Ptashnikov] Good day, comrades. In sorting out our program's mail -- and this time it is particularly plentiful, since the program was not on the air last week -- I became convinced that as always the majority of radio listeners are most interested in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations at the contemporary stage. This is not surprising since it is clear to everyone that the situation on the planet depends to a significant if not to a decisive extent on the policies of the USSR and the United States and their concrete actions in the international arena. But these actions show that for the time being, unfortunately, the sides see ways to lower tension and the level of military confrontation and attain real accord on weapons control differently.

As is known, the Soviet Union has come forward with a number of constructive proposals and has made certain concessions which have made it possible to talk about the possibility of concluding an agreement on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe in the near future. Conditions were also created for attaining accord on operational and tactical missiles. What about the United States and its allies in the NATO block? Making use of various kinds of reservations and pretexts, putting forward far-fetched and clearly unjust conditions, they are trying in every way to delay the resolving of these most important current problems.

How can one not concur with the view of our radio listener (Ivan Nikolayevich Bochkov) from the village of Russkaya Sorma in the Chuvash ASSR, who writes: In political talks between the USSR and the United States, it is essential to always show a businesslike, reasonable approach, meeting the interests of both countries, to solving problems which have come to the fore. Only a realistic appraisal, not a negative position, can open up constructive ways and methods to get out of a critical position or an impasse. Comrade Bochkov stresses: The unwillingness of the United States to resolve the question of the impermissibility of nuclear war shows that the Reagan administration is pushing both its own people and the people of other countries toward ruin, to the limits of destruction itself.

Why does the United States take such an unconstructive position? How is its unwillingness to go for realistic steps in the field of disarmament explained? How are the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva proceeding at the moment? These and a series of similar questions are asked in letters from Comrades (Yemchenko) from Krasnodar Kray, (Makarov) from the village of (Krivoz Erye) in Penza Oblast, and many other radio listeners. I ask Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS observer on military questions, to answer them:

Vladimire Nikolayevich, what is the state of affairs at the moment at the Geneva talks on the problem of medium-range missiles?

[Chernyshev] The Soviet proposal on the separate resolving of the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe has highlighted in a new way the state of affairs at the talks. The main question has today been put on a practical plane: Is there or is there not to be an agreement which would lead to the elimination in Europe of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles, limit their minimal level outside Europe and thereby make it possible to implement a real breakthrough in the field of nuclear disarmament?

What is the Soviet position at the moment? First and foremost it ought to be noted that it is based on the accords attained in Reykjavik. Also, everything positive that emerged during preceding discussions at talks is taken into account. In particular, it is envisaged that the elimination of the Soviet Union's and the United States' medium-range missiles in Europe would be carried out in two stages over the course of 5 years. During the first stage the medium-range missiles and launch installations for medium-range missiles would be reduced by 50 percent, and in the second stage they would be fully eliminated. Simultaneous with the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union and the United States would implement measures for the limitation by each side to 100 warheads of medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the territory of the Soviet Union and on the national territory of the United States. The process of eliminating medium-range missiles would be started simultaneously by both sides and would be implemented under strict mutual monitoring [kontrol'em].

The Soviet Union has also proposed the elimination in Europe of the USSR's and the United States' operational and tactical missiles, that is, missiles with a range of from 500 to 1,000 km. Outside Europe it is proposed to resolve the question of such missiles on the analogy of medium-range missiles, that is, limiting by agreed minimal levels. The Soviet position also envisages an orderly system of verification [kontrol'ya] of the fulfillment of the future treaty. For example, it is envisaged that the dismantling or the destruction of medium-range missiles, launch installations, and corresponding auxiliary equipment, will be carried out in specially agreed areas. Verification measures [mery kontrol'ya] embrace both the exchange of data and observations, including on-site inspections [inspektsiyi] if necessary. Moreover, inspections would be carried out both within the limits of the territory of the other side and within the limits of the territory of third countries where, for example, the United States' medium-range missiles are deployed [pazmeshcheny].

It would seem that the Soviet draft is the basis that may allow in the shortest time for the working out of a joint Soviet-U.S. draft and for its submission for ratification to the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States. However, it is still too early to say that all obstacles for attaining such a result have been removed. In the United States' position, there remain as before conditions which objectively hinder the achievement of accord and which do not meet the task of lowering the level of nuclear confrontation but are rather calculated at preserving the United States' missile presence in Europe under a different pretext.

To speak generally, the course of the present talks of medium-range missiles shows that neither the United States nor certain of its allies in NATO, while proclaiming adherence to any solution on medium-range missiles, thought seriously about it, thinking that the Soviet Union would never accept it. It is this that explains all manner of obstacles which are now being put forward on the road to resolving the question.

[Ptashnikov] But recently a meeting of the NATO council would seem to have adopted a decision to answer positively the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles. So, what is hindering the attainment of an agreement in Geneva? Could you not describe what elements in the U.S. position have been an obstacle?

[Chernyshev] Well first and foremost I would note three main obstacles in the U.S. position. First, we are talking about the United States; striving to write into a future treaty the right to reequip Pershing-2 medium-range missiles located in Europe as missiles with a shorter range. What does this mean in practice? It means that after a small alteration, the procedure for which has already been worked out in the United States at enterprises of the Martin Marietta concern, the second stage is removed from a Pershing-2 missile; the first stage with the nuclear warhead is left; some electronic equipment on launch installations is replaced and the Pershing-2 thereby would seem to stop existing. But that is only as it seems. In actual fact, according to specialists, including U.S. ones, the reverse operation is carried out no less simply. The second stage is brought in, the sets of electronic equipment are restored, and in a matter of 48 hours or so you again have a Pershing-2 missile in combat condition. So, if such a procedure were allowed, the removal of the U.S. Pershing-2 missiles from Europe would become the purest fiction. Equally unattractive is the U.S. position on land-based cruise missiles of the medium-range class. They want to retain the right to keep these missiles in Europe instead of destroying them. Moreover, the proposal is that they should either remove the warheads from the missiles, or else transfer the missiles themselves to ships at sea.

The second thing that ought to be noted as an obstacle to reaching an accord is the order of reduction being proposed by the United States. According to the U.S. scenario, only the Soviet Union's medium-range missile will be reduced in the first stage, while the United States would merely verify [proveryat] and inspect the actions of the USSR. The U.S. bases and the U.S. missiles would remain closed to verification [kontrol] by the Soviet side. It is obvious that this approach is not in accord with the principle of equality and identical security. Therefore the Soviet proposal envisages the need for a simultaneous process of elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. Even with the difference in quantity -- let me remind you that the Soviet Union is going to reduce more weapons than the United States -- that reduction could be carried out in equal percentages. It is also necessary that a system of verification [kontrol] should come into operation from the very beginning in both directions, so that the Soviet Union can be sure the destruction of medium-range missiles in Europe is being carried out in accordance with the agreement reached.

Finally, the third obstacle is the unwillingness of the United States to accept the principle proposed by the Soviet Union, under which the medium-range missiles remaining on the national territory of the USSR and the United States must be sited [razmeshchatsya] in such a way that their warheads cannot reach the territory of the other side.

That proposal is dictated by the fact that the deployment [razmeshcheniye] of medium-range missiles by the United States within range of the territory of the USSR -- in Alaska, for instance -- would mean in effect that the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union would be increased while the USSR was in no way increasing the nuclear threat to the United States, and would, moreover, be reducing its nuclear armaments. Appeals to the notion that the United States cannot agree to give up the right to deploy [razmeshchat] some of its medium-range missiles in Alaska because Alaska is part of its national territory simply do not bear examination. After all, the Soviet Union is willing to introduce certain restrictions, even in its own territory, on the deployment of its remaining medium-range missiles. Among such restrictions would be, for example, the following: They would not be deployed west of the 80th meridian, so that they would not reach the territory of Western Europe, and they would also be deployed so that in the eastern and northeastern direction they would not be within range of the territory of the United States.

[Ptashnikov] In connection with a possible agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe, there is a lot of talk in the NATO countries about the West German Pershing-1A missiles. It is being claimed that the Soviet demands concerning these missiles are holding back the talks. Is there any truth in that?

[Chernyshev] No, none at all. I think this issue needs to be clarified, because it is being presented to the world public in an obviously distorted way. First of all it must be emphasized that the Soviet Union is not raising the question of missiles and launching facilities belonging to a third country that is not a party to the Soviet-U.S. talks, that is, West Germany. Let common sense, and the sense of responsibility to the peoples that is so necessary in our time, tell the West Germany Government what it should do with those missiles and launching facilities. What is under discussion in Geneva is something quite different: the nuclear warheads that belong to the United States and are not destined for West German missiles. Now these certainly are not weapons belonging to third countries, as Washington and Bonn are trying to make out. If they belonged to West Germany, then a most serious problem would arise: the problem of violation by the United States and the Federal Republic of the Treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Under Article 1 of that treaty, the United States undertook not to transfer nuclear weapons and control over them to anyone, either directly or indirectly; and under Article 2 of the same treaty, the FRG undertook not to accept the transfer from anyone of nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly. If both sides are fulfilling the treaty, then the United States does still remain the owner of the warheads for the West German missiles; and consequently, to consider them as weapons belonging to third countries is simply absurd. From this follows the legitimacy of the Soviet demand that these warheads be destroyed during the total elimination of the U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

So, even though after many months of delays and shake-ups, NATO would appear to have given a positive answer to the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles. Yet the elucidations that followed, and the actual U.S. position at the talks, certainly put us in our guard. Once again, as so often before, we see attempts to retreat from what had been agreed between Washington and Moscow at the political level. Once again, demands are being put to the Soviet Union that run counter to the principles of equivalent security.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COLONEL: U.S., FRG 'CREATING OBSTACLES'

PM071319 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jul 87 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Military Sciences Colonel V. Nazarenko article: "Chain of Endless Problems; Who is Creating Obstacles on the Road to Agreement"]

[Text] The foundations of an agreement to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe were laid, as is well known, in Reykjavik during the summit between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. The Soviet Union made a major concession: It agreed to completely destroy the sides' medium-range weapons on the European Continent and leave the French and British nuclear potential outside the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks. It must be said bluntly that it was only thanks to the Soviet Union's bold actions that the Reykjavik formula -- zero medium-range missiles in Europe and 100 warheads each on the same missiles in the Asian part of the USSR and correspondingly on U.S. territory -- became possible.

Subsequently, with a view to reaching agreement on medium-range missiles, the Soviet side made new constructive proposals aimed at removing the obstacles that had arisen in working out coordinated decisions and were holding back the possibility of a real breakthrough in the nuclear disarmament sphere. The Soviet Union considered it possible to spotlight the problem of eliminating medium-range missiles from the overall package of proposals on nuclear and space arms. Meeting the West halfway, it consented to the simultaneous elimination in Europe of operational and tactical missiles -- that is, nuclear missiles with a range of between 500 and 1,000 km. A readiness to resolve the medium-range missiles problem in the Asian part of the USSR and on U.S. territory was also stated, if U.S. nuclear means were withdrawn from Japan, South Korea, the Philippines and carrier fleets in the Pacific were confined to agreed areas.

It would seem that all the obstacles in the way of eliminating medium and operational and tactical missiles have been removed. But the West is putting forward new conditions and provisos and coming up with an endless chain of different problems.

Wherein lies their essence? First and foremost is the U.S. desire to replace the destruction of Pershing-2 missiles with a "harmless" operation reequipping them (mainly by removing the second stage) as Pershing 1B'S. Incidentally, this procedure has already been developed at Martin Marietta enterprises. We note that the reverse operation takes just 48 hours. The conclusion is obvious: Permitting such an option would mean recognizing that the elimination of Pershing-2's was a fiction and virtually consenting to their retention by the United States, only under a different name.

Nor can the U.S. desire to be entitled to redeploy (instead of destroy) its ground-launched cruise missiles from Western Europe to submarines and surface ships be a basis for serious discussion. Some people would like to leave these missiles in their former positions altogether, merely replacing their nuclear warheads with conventional warheads.

Nor is the cause of reducing levels of military confrontation served by the U.S. claims to site its medium-range missiles in Alaska from where they could reach Soviet territory. This is essentially a buildup in the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union. But Soviet medium-range missiles in Asia, as is well known, pose no threat to U.S. territory.

The FRG Government's desire to retain 72 Pershing 1A operational and tactical missiles with a range of 740 km on FRG territory is a serious obstacle to reaching an agreement. [paragraph continues]

The Pershing 1A missiles in service with the FRG Air Force do indeed belong to West Germany, and nobody is planning to take the Bonn generals' favorite "toy" away from them. But the nuclear warheads for these missiles belong to the Americans. We must assume that Federal Chancellor H. Kohl is well aware of this. Nonetheless, speaking in the Bundestag recently, he stated: "The 72 German Pershing 1A missiles cannot be included in the U.S.-Soviet 'zero' option." But in an interview with the newspaper DIE WELT U.S. President R. Reagan said: "...The United States will not hold talks about the systems of third countries. The Russians demanded no limitations on the Pershing 1A missiles held by the Germans. They did not raise the matter at the 1985 summit, the 1986 Reykjavik summit, or during the meetings between Secretary of State Shultz and leading Soviet politicians in Moscow this April." There is only one authentic statement in these claims: The West German missiles were not and are not a topic at the Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States. These talks are discussing the elimination of medium-range missiles, operational and tactical missiles, and the corresponding nuclear warheads held by only two powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States.

As for "third countries," whose systems are not a topic at the talks, we note that in this case this refers to the European nuclear powers -- Britain and France -- whose corresponding arsenals and weapons systems have been set aside; that is, they are not taken into account at the talks. Therein lies our great concession to the West, and we stress -- it is a concession. But it does not extend to the FRG. After all, West Germany is not a nuclear power.

Whereas previously the United States and its NATO allies tried to claim that arming the Bundeswehr with Pershing 1A missiles was not a violation of the nonproliferation treaty, since -- so they claimed -- the FRG still had no right to use those weapons unilaterally, a qualitatively different situation is now taking shape. West Germany's desire to dictate whether or not this type of nuclear weapon can be eliminated amounts to an attempt to enter the "nuclear club" by the back door and obtain control over the firing button in practice. In other words, it is a question of infringing the fundamental principle of the nonproliferation treaty, Article 2 of which prohibits the nonnuclear powers from controlling nuclear weapons. As for the United States, its consent to such actions by Bonn demonstrates the U.S. side's desire to break its commitments under Article 1 of the treaty, which prohibits the nuclear powers from transferring control of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear countries.

So why are people in the West insisting on the "special status" of the Pershing 1A's? What is the essence of the NATO stratagems regarding these missiles?

The answer is simple: After eliminating Soviet operational and tactical missiles the Americans would like to find themselves to be in practice the only owners of this class of nuclear missile weapon in Europe by retaining their warheads on the Bundeswehr's missiles. And the Bonn Defense Ministry is prepared to go further. It is planning to replace Pershing 1A's with more modern Pershing 1B's. Yet these are precisely the missiles which would not be hard to reequip as Pershing-2 missiles. This is what the appeal of the West German freedom-fighters' coordinating committee has to say on the subject: "Whoever intends to retain Pershing 1A's with nuclear warheads is opposed to 'double zero.' Zero plus zero does not equal 1A. Whoever says Pershing 1A also says Pershing 1B." That is how Bonn wants to retain a loophole to carry out a new "arms upgrading" of the Bundeswehr using improved operational and tactical missiles able to carry nuclear charges. One's attention is drawn to a report in the U.S. newspaper DEFENSE NEWS. It states that even after the 108 Pershing-2 missiles are withdrawn from European soil, their technology may still prove useful. Weapons contractors and Pentagon leaders are sure that this will be followed by the creation [sozdaniye] of a version of the Pershing which will be deployed as a battlefield missile. [paragraph continues]

And it turns out that the highly accurate guidance system on the Pershing-2 can be used on other missiles that have already been deployed. That is why people in the West, while referring with approval to the idea of eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe, immediately stated that "there can be no question of an unconditional adoption of the Soviet proposal for a zero option for missiles with a range of 500-1,000 km." That is why West Germany is simultaneously "pro" and "con" the zero option. NATO is also dominated by the "nuclear deterrence" concept, to which there is allegedly "no alternative in the foreseeable future." So there should be no talk as yet about a resolute breakthrough in the West's approach to security questions.

NATO's "yes" to the "double zero" is undoubtedly progress. There is hope that the Soviet and U.S. representatives in Geneva will now find it easier to reach agreement. It is also a fact that the recent NATO Council Session's adoption of the proposal to eliminate operational and tactical missiles along with medium-range missiles would have been harder to achieve without the dynamism of Soviet foreign policy and the pressure on the Atlanticists from the antiwar movement. Nonetheless Europe is currently going through a complex period. It is a kind of moment of truth for the continent. Breaking with the dangerous trend of the nuclear arms race requires state wisdom and political will. It is time to translate the process of ridding the European Continent of its mountains of nuclear weapons into practice. Agreement is possible, but the obstacles in the way of its achievement have not yet been wholly eradicated. Will there be an agreement or not? It is up to the West. Political realism and common sense must prevail.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA QUESTIONS UPBEAT VIEW OF ARMS TALKS

PMO61107 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 87 Second Edition p 6

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev "Political Diary": "Pluses and Minuses"]

[Text] You need not be specially gifted to notice a certain cheerfulness in Western politicians' assessments and forecasts when the talk turns to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. [paragraph continues]

Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti, for example, recently expressed the conviction that an agreement there "has become more than likely." Fernandez-Ordonez, his Spanish colleague, emphasized the importance of concluding a treaty on the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles "as early as this year." On a visit to Finland French President F. Mitterrand remarked, with an eye on Geneva, that "the vicious circle of the arms race is not inevitable."

Well, this prospect exists. A unique opportunity has been opened up by the well-known Soviet proposals. The possibility has really emerged of concluding an agreement on medium-range and operational and tactical missiles and thereby taking the first step toward eliminating nuclear arsenals and strengthening security and peace. Statements by West European figures reflect to some extent "restrained, cautious optimism," to use diplomatic language.

But let us take a close look at the Western mass media these days. They go much further. Virtual euphoria reigns in them. And it is being nurtured primarily from Washington.

Correspondents there besiege White House and State Department spokesmen every day. Is there a "breakthrough" in Geneva? Will there be a new meeting of the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministers, and when? Rumors and patently deliberate "leaks" portray the situation in Geneva in an unprecedentedly rosy light. Even the FINANCIAL TIMES overcame its English reserve the day before yesterday. "Many specialists in the arms control sphere in Washington," it is reported from there, "are convinced that the main obstacles in the way of an agreement have been removed and that the remaining problems seem greater than they in fact are because the talks are at the concluding stage."

It is precisely the reference to specialists that elicits caution. For they must know how things really stand in Geneva. Pluses there may be, but are there really no serious minuses and drawbacks [izderzhki] there?

To summarize competent opinions which I have heard, it could probably be said that the talks on medium-range missiles are, by and large, proceeding well and formulations are being finalized for a joint draft agreement where unagreed positions are placed in parentheses. The public has been intimidated all the time with the problem of verification -- that will be the stumbling block, it is said. But here, too, the search is on in Geneva for a solution to what are objectively very complex problems. At the same time, if we are not to have our head in the clouds, we should ask ourselves if there are grounds for asserting that the preparations for a treaty are nearing completion. I would not undertake such an assertion. And the snag here is that the United States and its NATO allies, even after the well known constructive Soviet proposals and compromise steps, are erecting more and more obstacles. And their flimsy and artificial nature sticks out like a sore thumb.

Let us take the problem of operational and tactical missiles. The Americans want to "save" from the reckoning and from destruction their 72 nuclear warheads which are in the FRG for the same number of Pershing 1A operational and tactical missiles belonging to the Bundeswehr. Each one of those warheads is approximately 10 times more powerful than the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. A total of 720 Hiroshimas! And they want to hide this potential in their pocket on the pretext that the Geneva talks do not concern the systems of third parties.

But if these warheads do not belong to the FRG and are U.S. property -- which is officially confirmed both in Bonn and in Washington -- what third party can there be a question of? There is no logic. It is a question of U.S. warheads.

In this connection they also try to hide behind "the existing system of cooperation with allies," which, they say, is not open to discussion either. However, if this cooperation includes the Bundeswehr's use of U.S. nuclear charges, this signifies a violation (and a double violation at that, on both the U.S. and the West German sides) of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The U.S. side seems to have become entangled in its conditions and provisos, or is doing this consciously, but it is clear even to a child that the U.S. nuclear potential cannot be preserved unilaterally if the problem of eliminating operational and tactical missiles is to be solved.

They are also trying to manipulate Pershing-2's, raising the question of the "right" to reequip them as Pershing-1B operational and tactical missiles. But it is technically possible, as is known, to turn the latter back into the original medium-range missiles in a few hours.

Simple arithmetic. Something like subtraction and addition of missile stages. And it is such naive arithmetic that one American commentator placed it in the category of "trumps at the talks." But attempts at bluff also quite obviously characterize the NATO approach to the responsible task in Geneva.

The propaganda to the effect that things are going well is more subtle. They plainly wish to lull the international public with its help. To divert its attention away from the true stand of those NATO circles which put forward one condition after another, preventing an agreement in Geneva from being converted from a possibility into a reality.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: SOVIET REACTION TO KOHL'S 4 JUNE STATEMENT

'Opponent of Nuclear-Free Europe'

LD041240 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1007 GMT 4 Jun 87

[Text] Bonn, 4 Jun (TASS)--The government statement on disarmament issues made by FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl in the Bundestag today shows that Bonn is an opponent of the idea of creating a nuclear-free Europe. Stating the FRG Government's readiness to act in the spirit of the "new thinking", Kohl at the same time stood up for the outdated strategy of "nuclear deterrence" which runs counter to the demands of our time. While giving general support to proposals for the elimination of medium-range missiles, and operational-tactical missiles as well, the chancellor at the same time made implementation of these dependent upon a number of conditions. Chief among these is the demand that the Pershing-1A missiles in service with the Bundeswehr alongside U.S. nuclear warheads should not be included in the "double-zero option" for nuclear missiles in Europe.

'Leads Attack on Nuclear Disarmament'

LD052004 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 5 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jun (TASS)--By TASS military writer Valdimir Bogachev:

Politicians of NATO countries express satisfaction about the FRG Government's consent to endorse the "fundamental principles" of the agreement on Euromissiles now being drafted. They in NATO capitals are saying gleefully: "Kohl has achieved.... The chancellor has laid down the foundations..."

And the warmest congratulations are now sent to Bonn by precisely those Western politicians who quite recently had been rejecting out of hand the very idea of any advance toward nuclear weapons free Europe. And they praise Kohl not for withdrawing his extremely entangled objections to arrangements but for the reservations which might reduce to nought the chances of achieving a mutually-acceptable agreement.

As is known, at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva the sides formulated the first joint draft treaty on medium-range missiles, thus making an important step forward. It is also known that a number of aspects in the present U.S. policy

on medium-range missiles put obstacles to the further progress at the talks: The United States demand for the possibility of reequipping U.S. medium-range missiles into other nuclear weapon systems, Washington's claims to deploy its medium-range missiles, that remain under the treaty, in Alaska, that is within reach of Soviet territory, the United States refusal to start eliminating its medium-range missiles when the Soviet Union starts eliminating its own.

And the FRG Government tries to add new difficulties to these unresolved questions, to place new barriers in the way of achieving agreement. Kohl, for instance, objects categorically to the elimination from Europe of shorter-range missiles with a range of from 500 to 1,000 km. The FRG chancellor is obviously trying to entangle the question of the West German "Pershing-1A" missiles. Under the Soviet proposal, the United States should eliminate nuclear warheads to West German "Pershings", the warheads it controls. No one proposes to eliminate shorter-range missiles of the FRG which, by the way, can be fitted out with conventional warheads. It is only the elimination of U.S. warheads to those missiles that is envisaged.

Contrary to statements of some NATO politicians about the "heartening change in the FRG stance". Bonn continues hampering the process of reaching agreement on Euromissiles. By all indications, Chancellor Helmut Kohl remains in the lead of the attack on nuclear disarmament in Europe and he teams up in this with "extreme Atlanticists" such as French Defense Minister Andrei Giraud.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1561

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS ANALYST ON KOHL 23 JUNE INF STATEMENT

LD241859 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 24 Jun 87

[text] Moscow June 24 TASS — TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

At the June 23 meeting of the CDU-CSU group in the Bundestag, Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) again pressed for not including U.S. nuclear warheads which are intended for the West German Pershing-1A missiles in a future Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

To make the case more convincing, the chancellor gave a whole number of 'considerations' which in actual fact only indicate that something is wrong with his logic.

Take, for example, two of his premises. The first of them is that only the weapons possessed by the negotiating powers should be considered at the talks in Geneva.

The other one is that the government of the FRG has no right to be in charge of U.S. nuclear warheads for Pershing-1A missiles, and does not seek to get such a right.

The most elementary logic calls for drawing the following single-valued conclusion from these two premises: once the warheads are American, this means that they are not West German. If they belong to the United States and are intended for shorter-range missiles (and the Pershing-1A ones are such), then they should be included in a treaty envisaging the elimination of all missiles of this class.

The demand for keeping such warheads in U.S. possession directly contradicts the U.S. consent to full elimination ("full zero") of shorter-range missiles of the Soviet Union and the United States in Europe. Such an approach is obviously aimed at gaining unilateral advantages for NATO.

Then Helmut Kohl tried to "substantiate" the need to keep U.S. nuclear warheads for West German missiles by saying that the Soviet Union would keep 100 warheads for SS-20 missiles in the Asian part of its territory and thereby, ostensibly, 'a potential threat posed by such systems to Western Europe would keep on'.

In so doing the chancellor "forgets" that on a reciprocal basis the United States would also have 100 warheads on medium-range missiles. But again the association with missiles belonging to the FRG is far-fetched.

The U.S. warheads for shorter-range missiles have no bearing at all on Soviet strategic nuclear systems.

The chancellor ties everything up into a single tangle by stating that Soviet strategic systems 'will threaten Western Europe'.

Let it be known to Helmut Kohl that the sides participating in the Geneva talks have agreed to single out strategic systems for a separate solution. This is to the credit of the Soviet Union which agreed to meet the USA half-way, although U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe are strategic arms with regard to the Soviet Union and its allies.

So, all the 'arguments' adduced by the chancellor of the FRG are quite untenable, and this must be clear to any unprejudiced person.

Full elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium- and shorter-range missiles clearly signifies the impossibility of leaving any warheads for the missiles of these classes in Europe on this or that side.

A different approach would be illogical and dangerous. As for the insistence with which Helmut Kohl advocates the keeping of U.S. nuclear warheads, it is explained quite simply: The chancellor of the FRG grudges parting with the role of 'co-possessor' of nuclear weapons and losing nuclear warheads for West German missiles.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1561

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET MEDIA HIT FRENCH-FRG TALKS ON MILITARY COOPERATION

'Playing With Fire'

LD242322 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1700 GMT 24 Jun 87

[Text] President Francois Mitterrand and Defense Minister Andre Giraud have approved the proposal by West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl on the establishment of a French-West German military formation. According to President Mitterrand, this is the prototype for the common defense of Europe. The moment chosen for the announcement of the establishment of a mixed brigade, our observer Vsevolod Mikhaylov writes, is very telling.

In Europe the first concrete steps are being sketched out to pave the way to disarmament, with, on a practical level, discussion of the problem of eliminating medium- and shorter-range Soviet and U.S. missiles from Europe. Thus real prospects are arising for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, with France and the FRG, albeit with many reservations, officially backing the double-zero option. In this context it is impossible to see the new militaristic project declared by Bonn and supported by Paris as anything but a countermeasure, and a deliberate attempt to snub the antinuclear movement which has taken shape in Europe. After all, it is not merely a question of a French-West German brigade, nor of the duty attachments to be carried out over the next 10 years by all the officers of the FRG Armed Forces in the French Army, and vice-versa. What we are talking about is much more important -- namely dangerous large-scale militarist maneuvers whose aim is to establish a new military alliance -- the so-called European defense -- and the FRG's unconditional association with nuclear weapons.

A number of politicians on both sides of the Rhine associate these plans with the European defense project. According to Alfred Dregger, president of the CDU/CSU group in the Bundestag, for example, the two countries form a strategic unit owing to their geographical situation. The group believes that this circumstance calls for appropriate conclusions in respect to both conventional and nuclear weapons.

The FRG does not want to abandon the hope of having access to nuclear weapons at all costs, and not only by developing such weapons on its own territory. Judging by the statements of West German leaders, they would like to take advantage of European defense in order to have the last word in the use of those weapons. This is not the first time Bonn has shown its nuclear ambitions, and there is thus no surprise on that score. What is surprising, however, is the exceptional readiness with which Paris wants to satisfy the nuclear appetite of the West German military. The political

precepts of General de Gaulle, who was vigorously opposed to all plans to integrate the FRG into the nuclear program, have been forgotten, just as political common sense and elementary logic have been. Not only the right wing, but also Socialist figures such as Former Defense Minister Charles Hernu stress the need to forge ahead and begin studying the formation of a new concept of so-called enhanced deterrence, which means the integration of the FRG in the sphere of activity of the French nuclear force.

With the prospect of the elimination of Euromissiles, Paris thus intends to offer a sort of nuclear compensation to the FRG in the shape of a French nuclear umbrella. What, then, will happen to the independence of the French nuclear force which Paris carefully prevents from being included along with that of NATO? It is very well known that the FRG is not content with being the biggest European NATO power; it also remains the United States' principal military partner in Western Europe. According to statements by its leaders, it has no intention of giving up its leading role. For Bonn, the extension of military cooperation with France means, in fact, even greater integration into NATO's military strategy. How, then, is one to know whether or not France is involved in NATO's military systems? Whatever happened to the independence of the French Nuclear deterrent?

Michel Debre, the former prime minister and a close aide of General de Gaulle, recently stressed that Paris is adopting an illogical and inconsistent attitude to Chancellor Kohl's idea. He rejected the idea of the formation of a French-West German brigade, pointing out that it runs counter to the spirit of the national deterrent strategy. Indeed, having adequate means to guarantee one's own security is one thing, but stepping up the danger of a nuclear catastrophe in a bid to extend one's nuclear umbrella to other countries is something else again. Paris and Bonn cite the survival of Europe as the pretext for the establishment of a European defense. In reality, however, they are concerned not with the future of Europe but with their own nuclear ambitions, which are diametrically opposed to the aspirations of the European people to rid the continent of nuclear weapons. They are playing with fire. To say the least, they are being less than serious in pretending that there is nothing to give rise to concern.

'French Nuclear Umbrella'

PM251039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

[Yuriy Zhukov Commentator's Column: "Nothing More Than a Symbol?"]

[Text] FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl's speech at a press conference in Bonn has caused quite a fuss in West Europe. That was no coincidence because the chancellor was advocating the expansion of military cooperation with France and for that purpose the creation of a joint military formation, a West German-French brigade, which would symbolize that cooperation. President Francois Mitterrand of France, speaking 2 days ago in Cahors, approved this proposal.

What in particular does the French president like about the FRG chancellor's plan? The following: "The formation of a joint military subunit," he stressed, "will be a prototype of the so-called 'joint European defense'." That same defense plan, I should like to add, which the French Parliament rejected over 30 years ago -- and for the very reason that it saw it as a threat to French national interests.

Paris is saying that the creation of a "West European security union" (to use the words of A. Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] Bundestag group) will enable Western Europe to achieve greater independence in defense matters. But Bonn is in a hurry to reassure Washington that this plan in no way weakens the bonds of unity with the United States.

"This is not a question of the reorganization or disbandment of the Atlantic community," West Germany's well-informed GENERAL ANZEIGER stressed on 20 June. "In essence the idea of expanding cooperation between the FRG and France in the security sphere has been in existence for a long time. However, a new emphasis has appeared in the statements on the need for closer partnership among the European countries within the NATO framework and above all between France and the FRG...."

What emphasis is that? This question was answered on 2 May by CSU leader F.-J. Strauss. He stated that "the time has come to create a joint European nuclear potential." At the present time, when the question of eliminating the U.S. and Soviet medium-range and operational-tactical nuclear missiles sited in Europe is being tackled, Bonn is stepping up its attempt to secure a French "nuclear umbrella" and, if successful, a British one, too.

The facts now show that Paris is not opposed to going halfway toward satisfying those wishes. LE MONDE recently reported in an article entitled "Joint Defense" that "Paris could fit the nuclear warheads to the missiles which Bonn is capable of building." To this it only remains to be added that G. d'Estaing, chairman of a National Assembly commission, has proposed that France "announce that the independent nuclear deterrent forces will be used for the defense (!) of West Germany" (quote taken from the NEW YORK TIMES of 19 June).

As for the discussion on the creation of a "joint Franco-West German brigade" to symbolize cooperation between the FRG and France, this "symbol," in my view, has been devised merely to conceal the true nature of the matter.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1561

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG'S GENSCHER DISCUSSES MISSILES IN MOSCOW

LD071535 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 7 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jul (TASS) -- Conversations and a luncheon took place this morning in a building of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Aleksey Tolstoy Street. Taking part were USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher. This was reported today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists by Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the information of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

During the conversation, the matter of nuclear weapons in Europe was examined in detail. On the Soviet side, arguments were put forward in favor of the need for an agreement on INF, which would be the first step, and a major one, along the road toward solving the problem of European nuclear disarmament. The Soviet proposal, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, takes into consideration all the Europeans' fears and satisfies their wishes concerning the content of the accords.

But fresh obstacles are being put forward by the European side, hampering the reaching of accords. One of them is the demand for retaining the U.S. warheads for the Bundeswehr's Pershing-1A missiles. For what purpose is this being done? Perhaps the FRG is calculating on placing the warheads under its own control? But that would be the crudest violation of the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, with all the consequences ensuing therefrom, Boris Pyadyshev said.

On the question of Pershing-1A missiles, a rather strange picture is taking shape. The United States is nodding to the FRG Government, which is hiding behind Washington's back. Some people in Bonn say it is a Soviet-U.S. problem, and if that is the case, the Soviet Union should convince the Americans in Geneva of the need to solve it. But it is quite obvious and no one should be in any doubt, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, that it is not just a question of the United States position but also of the FRG position.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1570

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ASSESSES STATUS OF TOMAHAWK MISSILES

PM241509 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jun 87 First Edition p 3

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General (Reserve) F. Gontar article: "Sea-launched Cruise Missile Threat Again"]

[Text] At the recent NATO Nuclear Planning Group session in Stavanger (Norway) Pentagon chief C. Weinberger stated that in the event of an agreement to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe being concluded the United States envisages deploying an additional number of nuclear submarines and surface ships equipped with Tomahawk long-range cruise missiles in areas adjacent to the USSR's territorial waters as one measure to eradicate the alleged "imbalance" between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO. Such a buildup, in C. Weinberger's words, would expand NATO's potential to hit important targets on the territory of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries.

In connection with this statement it becomes clear why the U.S. draft agreement on strategic offensive weapons submitted 8 May this year at the Geneva talks does not contain any restrictions on the deployment of Tomahawk long-range nuclear cruise missiles on U.S. Navy (USN) ships. This has been done despite the fact that agreement on limiting such missiles was reached in Reykjavik.

It should be remembered that when the SALT II treaty was still being drawn up, the Soviet Union proposed a complete ban on long-range cruise missiles in all launch modes, or, if the United States was not prepared to do this, the imposition of the maximum restrictions on them. As is well-known, the Protocol to the SALT II treaty stipulated restrictions on the deployment of ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles with a range of more than 600 km. In the joint statement on the principles of and basic guidelines for subsequent Soviet-U.S. talks the sides undertook to examine the question of ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles in the future with a view to making a final decision on them. However, soon after the signing of the SALT II Treaty the U.S. Administration hurriedly declared the aforesaid Protocol void and in 1983 began unilaterally deploying ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCM's) in Europe and equipping naval ships with Tomahawk missiles in violation of the treaty.

Finally tearing up the SALT II treaty in 1986, Washington gave itself a free hand for an unchecked buildup in the combat potential of its strategic offensive forces (ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers) in accordance with the notorious program to "rearm America."

The natural question that arises is why -- given its powerful strategic "triad" -- is the White House striving at all costs to maintain and further build up strategic offensive weapons in the form of long-range nuclear cruise missiles deployed [razmeshchenny] on submarines and surface ships. [paragraph continues]

This is not being done for defense purposes or to ensure strategic stability, as the Pentagon strategists claim, but exclusively in order to have an additional channel for building up arms with a view to obtaining unilateral military-strategic superiority over the USSR. A statement made in 1985 by M. Karri [name as published], director of the U.S. Defense Department research agency, serves to confirm this: "Sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM's] provide a desirable increase in our nuclear potential, represent a unique opportunity to carry out unequivocal controlled retaliatory strikes, and can act as invulnerable reserve forces." The words cities about "retaliatory" strikes, needless to say, were only used to hide the true role of SLCM's.

The Pentagon intends to use the high strike accuracy (circular error probability 5-35 meters), high-yield nuclear charge (up to 200 kilotons), considerable range (up to 2,600 km), ability to approach the target undetected at extremely low altitudes (less than 100 m) by terrain contour matching and bypassing sites of active air-defense installations, and other combat qualities of Tomahawk cruise missiles in order to carry out surprise "disabling" nuclear strikes against important small-scale strategic targets (command centers, silo launch installations, nuclear weapons dumps, and others).

The true role of long-range cruise missiles was unambiguously stated by T. Simer [name as published], one of the creators of these missiles. He said in particular that the missiles are "undoubtedly an offensive, first-strike weapon, completely useless if there are no plans to utilize them for a surprise attack." This, it seems, is how Washington sees the "stabilizing" role of Tomahawks.

The Pentagon, as has repeatedly been reported in the U.S. press, plans to have over 4,000 Tomahawk cruise missiles in three versions in service by the beginning of the nineties. These include around 800 missiles equipped with nuclear warheads (with a range of up to 2,600 km) and around 2,600 conventionally armed missiles (with a range of 1,500 km). These versions of the missiles are intended for us against ground-based targets. A third version of 600 units of the Tomahawk is being manufactured as a conventionally armed antiship variant (with a range of up to 550 km). The pace of the production of all three versions of cruise missiles in the United States is approximately 500 units a year. Since there is no weight or size difference between Tomahawk cruise missiles with conventional and nuclear charges, from the technical viewpoint the reequipping of conventionally armed missiles with nuclear warheads poses no greater problem.

Tomahawk missiles, as has already been mentioned, started entering service with USN ships in 1983. In all, it is planned to equip up to 200 ships with them in the course of 10 years (up to 1993), including around 100 nuclear submarines and more than 90 surface ships. "Iowa" class battleships, "Virginia", "California" and "Long Beach" class nuclear-powered guided missile cruisers, "Ticonderoga" class guided missile cruisers, "Spruance" and "Arleigh Burke" class destroyers, and "Los Angeles" and "Sturgeon" class nuclear submarines have already become platforms for the missiles.

Currently up to 50 USN ships are equipped with Tomahawk missiles, including more than 30 nuclear submarines and 16 surface ships (3 battleships, 6 guided missile cruisers, and 7 destroyers). In total these ships carry over 350 delivery vehicles, including more than 180 delivery vehicles on ships of the Pacific Fleet and 170 delivery on ships of the Atlantic Fleet.

The combat areas for the surface ships and submarines from which Tomahawk cruise missiles could be used against targets on Soviet territory are the Norwegian, North, Barents, and Mediterranean Seas, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Sea of Japan, and the northern part of the Arabian Sea.

The special danger posed by Tomahawk cruise missiles is that their further unrestricted deployment increases sharply the risk of nuclear war. This is because outwardly the nuclear-armed missiles are replicas of their conventionally armed counterparts. The same launchers are used to launch the missiles. This undoubtedly leads to a lowering of the so-called "nuclear threshold" to a menacingly low level, since the side that is attacked will proceed on the basis of the worst scenario -- with all the consequences that entails.

The increase in the threat of a nuclear catastrophe is also linked with the fact that the massive deployment of Tomahawk cruise missiles on a considerable proportion of U.S. ships will lead to the dangerous infiltration of nuclear weapons into all the world's waters, which would undoubtedly have extremely negative consequences from the standpoint of increasing the likelihood of their accidental or unsanctioned use.

There is another danger, which lies in the fact that, since they are launched from coastal regions against targets on another country's territory, SLCM's will violate the airspace of third states, posing a real threat to their security.

Pentagon strategists are unable to hide the fact that the further siting of long-range cruise missiles on nuclear submarines and surface ships is leading to a dangerous increase in the level of the sides' military confrontation. A statement by U.S. Admiral Hostettler, leader of the Tomahawk program, serves to confirm this. Addressing congressmen, he said: "The aim of the United States is to complicate Soviet Armed Forces operations -- making them view each U.S. naval formation as a source of a potential threat coming from virtually all quarters -- through the large-scale deployment of various types and versions of highly accurate cruise missiles able to approach targets undetected." It is clear from this statement that Washington is concerned not about "defense" and "deterrence" but about fitting Tomahawks to its numerous ships constantly patrolling off the Soviet coast, and threatening the Soviet Union with possible nuclear strikes from various directions penetrating a considerable distance inside its territory.

These actions by U.S. ruling circles confirm yet again that they are stubbornly unwilling to come to terms with the realities of the nuclear and space age, and are gambling on the obsolete concept of "nuclear deterrence." While giving its verbal support for a 50-percent reduction in the strategic "triad," the United States at the same time wants to keep the way clear for an unrestricted buildup of long-range SLCM's -- this dangerous destabilizing strategic weapon. In other words, Washington is striving at all costs to obtain unilateral advantages, acquire military superiority over the USSR, and create a naval nuclear threat to it on a global scale. Under these conditions the Soviet Union will be forced to take the necessary measures in the interests of strengthening its security. Military-strategic parity will be maintained, but at a higher level, which will make the international situation less stable and more explosive. Responsibility for this rests wholly with the United States, as the initiator of the naval arms race.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1569

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRANCE'S PRIME MINISTER INTERVIEWED ON DISARMAMENT

DW291041 Bonn DIE WELT in German 29 Jun 87 p 9

["Exclusive" interview with Prime Minister Jacques Chirac by correspondent Peter Ruge in Paris; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] *Welt*: Will Moscow not have gained greater influence on German policy after the withdrawal of the Euromissiles, when there will remain a special threat to the FRG from the short-range battlefield missiles with a range below 500 km?

Chirac: France is fully aware of the problem that will be created in Germany through the shorter range missiles. The French Armed Forces stationed in the FRG are exposed to the same danger, which is concrete proof of solidarity. I would like to point out that the 10,000-12,000 warheads in the Soviet strategic arsenal represent the greatest nuclear danger to all West European countries. Seen that way, we are all in the same situation.

Welt: Nevertheless, the impression exists that France actually has abandoned the Federal Government over the issue?

Chirac: On the contrary, France — on this and other points — is in full solidarity with Germany, something I stated in connection with my Strasbourg talks with Chancellor Kohl.

Welt: Why did France not object to the Soviet disarmament concept with the argument that the reason for tension in Europe is not the threat from missiles, but the unnatural partition. Has not France urged since De Gaulle that Yalta must be overcome?

Chirac: In Moscow, I outlined to Mr Gorbachev our disarmament concept, which is not exactly in line with that of the Soviet Union. I put the emphasis on the necessity to place disarmament problems in the general context of East-West relations and on greater confidence between both parts of Europe. France accepts today, no more than it did yesterday, that Europe is divided into two blocs.

Welt: Let us discuss security doctrine. To date, France has proceeded on the basis of an FRG buffer zone with U.S. missiles providing deterrence. After their removal, would not the Fifth Republic's doctrine be changed — or will the "force de frappe" remain a purely French affair?

Chirac: I have stated that France's security will be decided at the borders of its neighbors. FRG territory, for the defense of which several tens of thousands of French soldiers stand prepared in peacetime, is not at all considered a buffer zone. Naturally, our nuclear forces will remain independent and national. However, in view of continued developments in Europe and the likely removal of missiles, I am convinced that the French contribution to deterrence — thus to preserving peace in Europe — will become increasingly important.

Welt: Some Paris deputies propose giving the Germans a second key to prestategic (tactical) French nuclear weapons that could be used on German territory as a sign that France will not desert its conventional partner in an emergency. Are you as much concerned about Salzgitter as you are about Strasbourg?

Chirac: The FRG did not ask us for a double key system, and I do not believe that the German Government in Bonn wants that. However, I want to tell you that preserving Germany's integrity constitutes an important security factor for France. There must be no doubt about that in Germany.

Welt: As to possible "extended" French nuclear protection including the FRG, is Paris counting on financial participation by the Germans — or are other methods of compensation conceivable?

Chirac: Several such interesting plans could be considered as Helmut Schmidt did. In every case, however, they are hypotheses for a far future.

Welt: Must not the defense of both peoples be put on a new common basis, or would you prefer a European army? Once before a European defense community failed because of the French attitude in 1954.

Chirac: Things have changed considerably since 1954. We maintain that strengthening security cooperation between France and Germany will play a decisive role in genuine European defense. Therefore, the initiative of Chancellor Kohl, my friend, regarding a possible German-French brigade has met with our interest and sympathy.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2566

THATCHER VOWS INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR DETERRENCE FOR UK

London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 11 Jun 87 p 46

[Article by David Millward]

[Text]

THE Prime Minister yesterday gave her strongest commitment of the election campaign to Britain's nuclear future yesterday when she vowed that the country's independent deterrent will be maintained at least until the end of the century.

Her pledge, which came at the Conservatives' final campaign Press conference, was seized upon by political opponents as representing a hardening of the Government's line on nuclear arms.

Asked whether she anticipated a situation in which nuclear weapons would be abandoned, Mrs Thatcher said, "I see no circumstances at present and I see no circumstances up to the end of this century."

The Trident system is due to be deployed in the mid-1990s with a decision on the next generation of nuclear defence being taken early in the next century.

"I don't think I will be the person taking that decision," Mrs Thatcher said yesterday.

Here to stay
Mr John Cartwright, the

Alliance Defence spokesman, said yesterday that the Government had previously implied that it was keeping its options open during the super-power negotiations.

"She is now saying they will be here come hell or high water.

"She appears to be saying that nuclear weapons are here to stay. This is a hard line position when the superpowers were talking in Reykjavik about getting rid of ballistic missiles within 10 years," Mr Cartwright said.

The Prime Minister's remarks have been seen as a reminder of Britain's concern that any superpower deal could prevent the Americans supplying Trident and would effectively "leave Britain in the lurch".

The first of Britain's Trident submarines is already under construction at the Vicker's shipyard in Barrow and, according to Whitehall sources, the Ministry of Defence is poised to give the green light for the second once the election is over — assuming the Conservatives win.

/9274
CSO, 5240/090

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

YUGOSLAV MONTHLY INTERVIEWS GDR FOREIGN MINISTER

LD011643 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1516 GMT 1 Jul 87

[Text] Belgrade, July 1 (TANJUG) — An agreement on the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe would be of lasting political importance to the world. It would further stimulate disarmament of all kinds, laying a firm basis for lasting peace and fruitful cooperation, of benefit to all.

German Democratic Republic Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer made the above statement in an interview to the July issue of the Yugoslav REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.

He said far more arms and troops were concentrated in Europe than in any other part of the world. The arms, however, do not increase security but rather the risk and danger of war, he set out.

Bearing in mind the past experiences of both German states and in the quest for a solution which would be both realistic and relatively easy to implement, a project on a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe has been drawn up. The joint proposal compiled by the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, which included the project, was forwarded to the Federal Republic of Germany on April 3, but no constructive reply whatsoever has been received so far, he said.

Under the proposed project, the corridor, around 300 km long between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries, would be free not only from nuclear warheads, but also carriers which can be used as launchers both for nuclear and conventional weapons. This would considerably diminish the danger of a military confrontation between the two military systems. Fischer set out, and specified that at the same time it would pave the way towards Soviet-U.S. negotiations on the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe and the reduction and liquidation of other nuclear arms deployed in the continent Fischer said.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Vienna follow-up has become an unavoidable factor in European politics and, with its far-reaching ideas, extends beyond the boundaries of the continent. The process, Fischer set out, can be interpreted as a model for the coexistence of countries with different social systems, and also serve to register the overall political climate in the world at large.

The GDR foreign minister said that the 101 countries and national liberation movements which make up the Non-aligned Movement represent a significant force in international relations. Yugoslavia, as the founder-country of the movement, makes an exceptional contribution as a factor of continuity and stability to non-alignment.

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR MILITARY EVALUATION: NATO STANCE AT VIENNA CONSULTATIONS

PM111845 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 87 First Edition p 3

[Editorial Article: "It Is Up to the West's Political Will"]

[Text] For almost 4 months unofficial consultations have continued in Vienna between representatives of Warsaw Pact and NATO countries on questions connected with drawing up the mandate of future negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. [paragraph continues]

As is known, a program for such reductions was put forward at the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee which took place in Budapest in June 1986. It envisages the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe by 25 percent in the early 1990's carried out simultaneously and as an integral package with tactical nuclear means.

Representatives of 23 countries are participating in the consultations: 7 from the Warsaw Pact and 16 from the North Atlantic Alliance. Over the past months they have done a certain amount of useful work. The very fact that the consultations are being held should be evaluated positively. During these consultations the representatives of the Warsaw Pact countries, acting in a businesslike and constructive spirit, have not only expounded their approach to talks on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, but have also made known their detailed considerations on elements of the mandate of future negotiations. They believe that the aim of the negotiations must be a stage-by-stage and substantial reduction of armed forces, and of tactical nuclear and conventional arms in Europe, and also the elimination in the course of the reductions of any inequality which might emerge in certain elements of armaments, by means of reductions on the part of those finding themselves ahead. It is presupposed that all components of ground forces and tactical strike aviation of European states and also of the corresponding forces and means of the United States and Canada stationed in Europe will be subject to reduction, together with their organic arms and combat hardware, together with tactical nuclear means. As for the participants in future talks, Warsaw Pact countries feel it would be expedient to conduct the discussion of reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe within the framework of an all-European forum, with the participation of all European states and also the United States and Canada.

Unfortunately, the stance adopted by the representatives of the NATO states during the consultations cannot be called constructive. So far, they still do not have a concerted position regarding the mandate for future negotiations and they are giving paramount importance to the far-fetched "problem" of the "military superiority" of the Warsaw Pact Organization over the NATO bloc. The United States and their closest NATO allies are insisting that the talks should be conducted only between the members of the two military-political alliances, outside the framework of the CSCE, and they are even trying to use the actual holding of the consultations to take de facto disarmament problems out of the all-European process.

Moreover, counter to the aims of the CSCE, targetting reduced military confrontation, and also counter to the tasks of the consultations in Vienna concerning future negotiations, the NATO countries at recent sessions of the supreme military bodies of this bloc in Brussels while talking about eliminating disproportionality in the armaments of the sides, have advocated an increase in the military potential of their alliance, the development [razrabotka] of new weapons systems based on modern technology for the sake of achieving military superiority over the Warsaw Pact Organization, and a further increase in military spending. If these facts are compared with the statements of a number of representatives of the NATO countries at the Vienna consultations, and especially the representative of the FRG, about the fact that they are adopting a wait-and-see position counting on new impetus from the North Atlantic bloc's council session taking place in Reykjavik just now, it is not difficult to imagine what form this "impetus" might take.

But whatever artificial obstacles are erected on the way to achieving mutually acceptable accords by certain participants of the Vienna consultations, and however they may try to retard the drawing up of a mandate for future negotiations, they are having to come to terms increasingly frequently with the realities of our times.
[paragraph continues]

The position expounded in the documents of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee adopted in Berlin at the end of May this year are of very important significance for moving the Vienna negotiations forward. They contain in concentrated form a proclamation of the political credo of the allied socialist states and a formulation of an invitation to the NATO countries to carry out joint actions in the matter of radically renewing international relations and making them more humane.

In this sense the reduction of armed forces and tactical and nuclear arms in Europe to such a level whereby neither of the sides, while ensuring its own defense, would have the forces and means for a surprise attack or for launching [razvertyvaniye] offensive operations, is of important significance.

In this connection the Warsaw Pact countries have appealed to all CSCE participant states to hold a meeting of foreign ministers which would make a decision on starting large-scale talks for the purpose of a radical reduction of armed forces and conventional arms and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe with the corresponding reduction of military spending. A number of top-priority measures connected with lowering the level of military confrontation and averting the threat of a surprise attack, the reciprocal withdrawal of the most dangerous, offensive types of armaments from the zone where the two military alliances are directly contiguous, and also the reduction of the concentration of armed forces and armaments in this zone to the minimum agreed level ought to be discussed at such talks.

In the opinion of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, the best forum for solving all these questions would be the second stage of the CSCE. At the same time other variations for the discussion of disarmament issues are possible, above all in the framework of the all-European process, including the convening of a special forum. In this connection the allied socialist states have stressed the important significance of the unofficial consultations taking place in Vienna which are required to promote the drawing up of a mandate for future negotiations.

The Warsaw Pact countries' statement of readiness to display the maximum restraint with regard to the development of their military potentials, to refrain on the basis of reciprocity from building up armed forces and armaments, and to declare a moratorium for 1-2 years on the increase of military spending is confirmation of the good will of the Warsaw Pact countries and of their desire to ensure the best conditions for future negotiations. They call upon the NATO countries to display just such an approach.

The profoundly thought out and carefully reasoned proposals, which are in accord with the interests of all the peoples of Europe, which were drawn up at the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee provide an opportunity for the representatives of the NATO countries at the unofficial consultations in Vienna to respond positively to them. The content of the proposals of the Warsaw Pact states is such that they are perfectly adequate so that the tasks facing the participants of the consultations may be defined and so that a corresponding constructive position may be taken, and so that the solution of these tasks may be embarked upon. It is impossible not to see that the development of world events, the change in international relations, the growing interdependence of states, and scientific and technical progress increasingly imperatively demand new political thinking and a new approach to questions of war and peace, disarmament, and other complex problems of the present time. It is precisely from this premise that the representatives of the Warsaw Pact countries are proceeding at the Vienna consultations. While defending their interests, they are also prepared to recognize the legitimate interests of their partners and they hopefully await a response by the NATO countries to the new proposals put forward in Berlin.

On 15 June the next meeting will take place in the framework of drawing up a mandate for future negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe. It is to be hoped that this meeting will take place fruitfully and will lead to progress in solving the tasks set before it. For this, all that is needed is the political will of its participants. The Warsaw Pact countries have plenty of this kind of will and they have proved it. Now the countries of the North Alliance must also display the same will for the successful conclusion of the consultations. It is up to them, and up to them alone.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1560

TASS EXAMINES REACTION TO 'JARUZELSKI PLAN'

LD020742 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun (TASS)--Commentator Anatoliy Shapovalov writes:

The comprehensive plan of reducing armaments and strengthening trust in Central Europe, proposed by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic Wojciech Jaruzelski, was immediately included in the contemporary international vocabulary and evoked widespread response abroad.

The closest attention was given to the initial zone suggested in it which encompasses Poland, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary as well as the FRG, the Benelux countries, Denmark and differs from the territorial frameworks of other measures of military detente that are being discussed.

The world reacted to this plan instantly and, as one should have expected, responses varied. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries supported the "Jaruzelski Plan" virtually on the next or the second day after its publication. This support sounded with new force from Berlin where a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states was held at the end of last week. If implemented, the communique of the meeting said, this plan could become an important factor of strengthening peace and stability in Europe.

And how did the West react? Restraint was predominant both in official statements and in press commentaries. The response of the NATO countries, a press conference for foreign journalists in Warsaw was told by the Polish Government spokesman Urban, shows that the "Jaruzelski Plan" is now being studied and analyzed. On the whole, he went on, one can speak of a businesslike and serious response to it.

An interested attitude to the plan was displayed among representatives of influential political forces in the West, parties, public movements and organizations, politicians, diplomats and scientists who are acknowledged experts in the field of security and disarmament.

As it was noted at a recent meeting of the fifth Poland-FRG forum in Kiel, special interest, first of all on the part of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Greens, was shown in the Polish concepts of imparting a purely defensive nature to military doctrines. After a reduction of the military potential of both sides this would rule out for all concerned the possibility of launching a military attack.

The "Jaruzelski Plan", it was noted in the discussion, exposes the arguments of the opponents of nuclear disarmament in the Bundestag and the Federal Government who contend that having a superiority in shorter-range nuclear arms and in conventional forces the Warsaw Treaty Organization supposedly refuses reductions in these particular fields.

The West, it was stressed at the meeting in Kiel, should give an answer to the Polish proposal.

A conference of scientists and, perhaps, military specialists from West Germany and Poland is to be held this summer with the purpose of analyzing the content and chances of the comprehensive plan of reducing armaments and strengthening trust in central Europe.

In short, the international public's response shows that Poland's comprehensive plan, which is not just a sum total of former proposals but an original document introducing a new approach in the sphere of disarmament, is being seriously studied.

It is consonant with the far-reaching initiatives of other socialist countries and underscores the dynamics of their proposals in the field of security and disarmament. It also echoes the idea of a nuclear-free Europe and facilitates the attainment of this goal.

We have faith that this plan will become the subject of an in depth and businesslike discussion during bilateral contacts with CSCE countries that we intend to start in the nearest future, the Polish Government spokesman stressed.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1560

TASS HITS ROGERS COMMENTS ON EUROPEAN CONVENTIONAL BALANCE

LD270539 Moscow TASS in English 0330 GMT 27 Jun 87

["Time to Take Concrete Actions" — TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev:

American General Rogers, who retires today as supreme allied commander Europe, again resorted at the official farewell party in Stuttgart on Thursday to trite statements alleging that the Warsaw Treaty states have an edge over NATO in conventional weapons and troops. Such statements are not new and were often refuted by facts showing the real correlation of force between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. As for the convention weapons, NATO politicians and strategists simply lie alleging that Warsaw Treaty has superiority. They arbitrarily compare the strength of the army and armaments under the supreme allied commander Europe with those of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

What should be compared, however, are not units but the potentials of the two military political alliances. Then the picture will be quite different. For example, NATO countries, undoubtedly, possess greater possibilities in terms of manpower and the economic potential and have an edge as regards the capacities of the defense industry. From the military point of view, these are all important factors.

Take population, for example. It is 1.5 times greater than in the Warsaw Treaty countries. Comparing the forces of the sides, Western strategists exclude the armed forces of France and Spain. Of course, the sides have certain disproportions in the structure of the armed forces and separate elements. NATO countries have a clear edge in the number of combat-ready divisions. It has 94, including some 60 combat-ready separate brigades, against 78, 11-12,000 people strong divisions, in the Warsaw Treaty.

By comparison, American divisions have 16,000-19,000 men and West German more than 23,000. Comparisons can be continued and they will not be in favour of those who artificially understate the NATO potential.

The Soviet leadership sets the task of banishing war from the life of peoples. A real step in this direction will be the lowering of the number of troops and conventional weapons in Europe on the basis of equality and equal security of the sides. NATO leaders are in no hurry to accept relevant Soviet proposals, although it is high time they replaced demagoguery with deeds.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1560

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

NATO-PACT MEETING 29 JUNE--Vienna, 29 Jun (TASS)--A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations by representatives of Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries on questions connected with working out the mandate of the future talks on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1400 GMT 29 Jun 87 LD] /9738

PACT DEPUTY MINISTERS MEET--Warsaw, 30 Jun (TASS)--The deputy ministers of foreign affairs of the Warsaw Pact states met in Warsaw today. They reviewed the results of the work carried out so far at the Viennese meeting of CSCE representatives, and the possibilities and prospects for successfully concluding it were examined. In this context certain concrete steps that could help in developing pan-European cooperation and improving mutual understanding between the participants of the CSCE were also discussed. The deputy ministers of Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Romania, USSR and CSSR had a discussion with Henryk Jaroszek, undersecretary of state of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and general secretary of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1611 GMT 30 Jun 87 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1560

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: ANNIVERSARY OF PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS TREATY

No U.S. 'Political Will'

LD262125 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 25 May 87

[Text] Moscow, 26 May (TASS)—TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes:

On 28 May eleven years ago a treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes was signed simultaneously in Moscow and Washington.

Owing to the U.S. refusal to ratify it, it has not entered into force to this day.

That the Soviet Union and the United States were able to reach an agreement on so important an issue even despite the fact that certain forces overseas were seeking to slow down the international detente process taking place at the time has demonstrated that very complex problems affecting the sides' important interests can be solved if only there is good will and a desire to come to terms.

Another important feature of the treaty has been that it provides for developing cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in various fields connected with underground nuclear blasts for peaceful purposes.

The sides have signed the treaty also to fulfill their commitments to limit underground nuclear testing under the 1974 treaty limiting such tests.

It became clear, however, especially after the present administration took over in 1980, that in Washington they were not going to terminate any nuclear explosions.

Over the eleven years the American side has invented many delaying tactics.

Even after the House of Representatives last year passed a resolution recommending the President to send the treaty to the Senate for ratification, the White House chief has been obviously dragging his feet over the issue and looking for all manner of ploys to make this possible [as received].

He has been compelled, however, to promise to ask the Senate next year to ratify the 1974 and 1987 [words indistinct].

Both the treaty and the protocol to it (Article 4), however, specify quite sufficient measures to checking compliance with the treaty, including national technical means, advance notice of planned underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and even access to blast sites under certain conditions.

But Washington has still taken a negative stand on the Soviet-U.S. accord.

The reluctance by the White House to agree, under a reciprocal accord with the Soviet Union, to an end to all nuclear explosions showed especially vividly during a unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts, including ones for peaceful purposes, from August 1985 till February 1987.

While there was silence at Soviet nuclear testing ranges, the United States conducted 25 nuclear explosions to master new kinds of weaponry, including space-based arms developed under the SDI program.

During the Soviet moratorium U.S. Administration officials systematically repeated their negative posture that "a moratorium on nuclear testing is not in U.S. security interests".

Mikhail Gorbachev in a speech last February expressed regret that continued nuclear testing by the Americans was putting an end to the Soviet moratorium.

But the moratorium has not been wasted, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said. The Soviet Union has proved by its moratorium that it is realistic to halt testing. It is only needed to have the political will for this.

All appearances are that Washington does not yet have this will.

U.S. 'Ruses' Obstruct Total Ban

PM281543 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[S. Nikolayev article: "To Ban Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] On 28 May 1976 the USSR and the United States signed the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. The conclusion of the treaty was an important stage in the process designed to lead to a total ban on nuclear weapon tests.

This process was initiated back in 1963 with the signing of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in Three Environments, and its logical culmination was to have been the conclusion of a treaty on a total nuclear test ban. However, the talks that had been held to that end were suspended by the United States in 1980 although the text of the corresponding treaty had been practically agreed

on and it only remained to resolve secondary questions. The United States thereby broke the pledge it had adopted in 1963 to "achieve forever an end to all test explosions of nuclear weapons" and to "continue talks to that end."

The reluctance to see the matter through to its logical conclusion is one of the reasons why the United States has still not ratified either the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Tests or the Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions. True, Washington does not verbally advocate ratification, but at the same time it lays down terms which lead virtually to a revision of these treaties.

This approach reflects the present U. S. Administration's general attitude to the problem of limiting arms, as manifested in the U.S. position at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms and at other talks.

Meanwhile, the question of a total ban on nuclear weapon tests is acquiring special topicality now that the new Soviet proposals are opening up a real prospect for radically reducing nuclear arms. The USSR is doing all in its power to achieve such a ban. But the American side is inventing more and more ruses to prevent this.

Taking into account the lack of U.S. readiness to solve this burning problem in a radical manner, the Soviet side during the talks in Moscow with U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz proposed elaborating a compromise formula. It is a question of agreeing on efficient methods of verifying the limiting and ending of nuclear tests, including experiments on each other's test sites. The thus improved verification methods could lead to the validation of the 1974 and 1976 treaties on the "threshold" limitation of nuclear explosions, as well as making possible the transition to substantial limitations on the number and yield of explosions, with a view to a total nuclear test ban as the ultimate goal.

Out of the entire proposed program of measures, however, Washington has shown interest only in control explosions on each other's test sites, while removing this proposal from the context of full-scale talks with a view to finally ending tests. At the same time, the United States links the resolution of this task to the process of reducing and eliminating nuclear arms—for which, incidentally, it does not display practical readiness. What is more, the Pentagon is implementing a large-scale nuclear test program for the purpose of creating [sozdaniye] space weapons components within the framework of SDI.

Seeking to lay a practical foundation for further actions aimed at limiting arms, the Soviet Union proposes to the American side agreeing on the "key provisions of agreements," providing, in particular, for the sides' pledge to begin talks without delay on ending nuclear tests. Such a document could form a real basis for reaching an accord which would give a strong boost to the movement toward nuclear disarmament.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1557

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS REPORTS ON U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS IN NEVADA

18 June Test

PM230951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Latest Test"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Jun--On Thursday the United States carried out a new nuclear explosions with a yield of up to 20 kilotons. The U.S. Department of Energy has reported this. The test code-named "Bri" [name as transliterated] was conducted on the Nevada test site. The nuclear device was detonated 138 km northwest of Las Vegas at a depth of 200 meters.

An Energy Department spokesman declared that the test "bore a relation to armaments" and was "very successful." AP reminds us that this was already the seventh explosion officially announced by the United States this year. In all, starting in 1951, there have been 666 officially reported nuclear explosions on the Nevada test site. However, the agency points out, that is not the total figure, since the U.S. authorities have reported far from all the nuclear explosions that have been carried out.

30 June Test

LD302020 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 30 Jun 87

[Text] New York, 30 Jun (TASS)--The United States conducted another nuclear test explosions code-named Panchuela, on its Nevada test range.

According to a spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy, its yield was up to 20 kilotons. The test was carried out underground at a depth of approximately 315 meters.

The ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency noted that it was the ninth declared nuclear test in the United States in 1987.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1557

FRENCH DEFENSE AIDES DENY U.S. NUCLEAR TEST OFFER

PM241540 Paris LE MONDE in French 23 Jun 87 p 10

[Unattributed report: "Denial From Giraud Over French Nuclear Tests in United States"]

[Text] The *International Herald Tribune* on 22 June indicates in a Singapore dispatch that the United States offered France the use of its installations in Nevada so it can continue its nuclear tests somewhere other than the Polynesian atoll of Mururoa — an offer that France apparently declined. The daily, published in Europe, cites as its sources Australian officials and American leaders accompanying Secretary of State Shultz on his tour of several Asian and Pacific countries.

The *International Herald Tribune* says that the contacts with France, which remained confidential and informal, took place on several occasions some years ago, the last contact being approximately a year ago. The Australian sources add that the United States made such an offer because it is anxious to maintain good relations with the countries of the Pacific region such as Australia and New Zealand, which are among those most strongly opposed to the French underground tests on Mururoa.

According to the daily, Washington officials have denied that such a suggestion was put to France. However, according to the *International Herald Tribune*, other American officials who follow Pacific affairs closely have confirmed the existence of such an offer.

French Defense Ministry sources have expressed "great surprise" at the publication of this article, adding that it is certainly a "feeler" designed to sound out France's response to the Pacific countries' protests against Paris' decision to continue its tests on Mururoa. They denied the information reported by the *International Herald Tribune*, which they consider "entirely unfounded." They also pointed out that France does not need to reply to an offer that it has not received, unlike Britain, which has long been using the Nevada site for its tests.

Circles close to Mr Giraud have made it known that France's nuclear autonomy, that is, its technical expertise about its deterrent, which depends on continuing its tests on Mururoa, irritates many people, and it is believed that the United States is trying to win over opinion in the South Pacific, if necessary by playing the antinuclear card against France. American diplomacy, the same sources add, is increasingly "omnidirectional" and Ronald Reagan's eclipse is facilitating the emergence of diplomatic initiatives in all directions.

According to Defense Ministry sources, last week Armed Forces Chief of Staff General Jean Saulnier, on a visit to Indonesia, suffered a similar case of "misinformation," as circles close to Mr Giraud called it. A British news agency dispatch attributed remarks to General Saulnier in which the French Armed Forces chief of staff said he favored the "denuclearization" of the Pacific and Southeast Asia. General Saulnier subsequently denied making the remarks attributed to him by the British source.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2565

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: SHULTZ VISITS SOUTHEAST ASIA, OPPOSES REGIONAL NFZ

Talks in Manila

LD171026 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 17 Jun 87

[Text] Manila June 17 TASS — Speaking here on June 16 at a press conference for local and foreign journalists after a four-day visit to the Philippines, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz dwelt on the results of his talks with President Aquino on the creation of a non-nuclear zone in South East Asia. During talks with Aquino and heads of the Philippines' Armed Forces the U.S. secretary of state said that the American military presence on the islands of the Philippine archipelago was an important factor contributing to stability in South East Asia and that the withdrawal of Pentagon bases from the Philippines would endanger the security of ASEAN countries. The U.S. secretary of state made it clear that Washington would not make concessions to ASEAN states by weakening the U.S. military presence in South East Asia.

This statement by the high ranking official of the U.S. Administration coincided with the conference of ASEAN foreign ministers in Singapore. During the conference its participants, including Vice-President and Foreign Minister of the Philippines Salvador Laurel, supported Indonesia's initiative on proclaiming South East Asia a non-nuclear zone. Noting that such coincidences are not accidental, local observers point to Washington's striving to use its military political ties with Manila to paralyse the non-nuclear initiative of ASEAN, which poses a serious danger to the long-term plans of the USA in South East Asia.

Plans To Press ASEAN

LD171731 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 17 Jun 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] Secretary of State Shultz, who is making a 10-day trip to Southeast Asia and Oceania, left Manila today. He set off for Singapore where he is to take part in the conference of ASEAN foreign affairs ministers of leading Western states. The conference will discuss regional and military problems of this region. Shultz was in the Philippines for 3 days; throughout the stay there were anti-American demonstrations. [video shows anti-U.S. demonstrations] Shultz go home! No to American bases! — these slogans pursued the Washington envoy everywhere. And no wonder, for the state secretary had come to the Philippines mainly to discuss the fate of the U.S. military bases with the country's leadership.

The Subic Bay and Clark Field bases are the largest U.S. military sites abroad. They have existed for 39 years; the treaty on the bases expires in 1991. This agreement will be reviewed next year. Washington is extremely interested in keeping Subic Bay and Clark Field and is using them as a lever to pressure the Aquino government on its economic and military aid. As far as the forthcoming conference in Singapore is concerned, Shultz intends to apply maximum efforts to induce the countries of Southeast Asia to renounce their prohibition on nuclear weapons in the area. Washington is seriously concerned the ASEAN countries will put their idea for creating a nuclear-free zone in Asia into practice and will show the U.S. war jets the door.

PRAVDA Commentary

PM221319 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

["Commentator's Commentary" by Aleksandr Serbin: "Two Trips With But a Single Aim"]

[Text] Meetings between ASEAN foreign ministers and so-called "dialogue partners" -- representatives of the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the EEC -- have begun in Singapore. They are taking place immediately after the ASEAN foreign ministers' conference held there. Interest in these meetings is heightened by the fact that the United States, which is represented in Singapore by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, is going all out to try to prevent Southeast Asia becoming a nuclear-free zone.

It was the logic of the development of world events that brought the ASEAN states -- Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines, and Brunei -- to the idea discussed in Singapore. Southeast Asia, where the consequences of U.S. aggression against Indochina are still felt, acutely needs the bases of peace to be consolidated and peaceful coexistence to be established among all the states forming part of it.

But that is precisely what the United States seeks to prevent. George Shultz, who went to Singapore via the Philippines, packed "arguments" against the creation of a nuclear-free zone in his political baggage. They boil down to it allegedly being difficult for the United States to counter "regional aggression and military threats" in Southeast Asia without atomic bombs. This concern over the region's "security" on the part of those who carried out aggression there during many years is pretty curious. But the United States is in no mood for jokes: After all, U.S. strategy in Southeast Asia is based on military strength, one of whose main components is nuclear weapons. In particular, the Pentagon, by common opinion, keeps them on military bases in the Philippines. And it is not fortuitous that Shultz, who made a stop in Manila, should have in his baggage further millions of dollars of "aid" whose aim is to influence the decision on the fate of those bases.

In Singapore, Shultz began by urging that Vietnam's isolation be maintained. The link between the appeal and the hope of obstructing creation of a nuclear-free zone is obvious. The setting of some Southeast Asian countries against others can only help the United States maintain its military presence there.

While George Shultz was heading for Singapore, another U.S. Administration figure, Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, set off for a trip round the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. His intention there is to discuss, in particular, the problems of ANZUS, a bloc with one foot in the grave because of the stance adopted by New Zealand, which has banned American warships carrying atomic weapons from its shores. The existence of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, which the United States tried to prevent just as it now doing in Southeast Asia, remains a thorn in the flesh of U.S. policy.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1557

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV ON NEW ZEALAND NUCLEAR-FREE DECLARATION

LD050509 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, the New Zealand parliament has passed a law proclaiming the country a nuclear-free zone:

[Video shows U.S. spokesman addressing journalists, clips of warships at sea, then commentator Sergey Alekseyev, identified by screen caption, to camera.]

[Aleksey] The U.S. State Department's official spokesman Charles Redman has said at the latest briefing in Washington: We regret the fact that New Zealand has made a decision to declare a nuclear-free zone. This gives the force of law to the New Zealand Government's present antinuclear policy, which is incompatible with the United States' global policies and is directed against the West. Redman accused the Wellington Government of undermining U.S. efforts to maintain peace in the southern Pacific. He announced that Washington will now deprive New Zealand of its status as a U.S. ally, changing its status to simply that of a friendly country. So, had New Zealand admitted U.S. warships with nuclear weapons to its ports, had it allowed U.S. and Air Force aircraft with their lethal payloads to intrude into its airspace, then peace would have become stable there; but by banning them it has undermined that peace. This is familiar Washington reverse logic.

What, then, will follow from this lowering of New Zealand's status? Clearly there will be a reduction in supplies of the latest weaponry and up-to-date military hardware from the United States. No doubt there is a possibility of some kind of economic sanctions by Washington on the rebel country, and who knows, maybe attempts to pull off in New Zealand something akin to what happened recently in Fiji. One thing is clear: Washington is unlikely to succeed in its aim of turning New Zealand and other southern Pacific peoples away from their anti-nuclear course, because the firm resolve of New Zealand and its neighbors in the region to pursue this course is not a matter of separate and solitary examples, but rather a reflection of a significant and irreversible process that is taking place today throughout the modern world.

And in that world there is today one more nuclear-free zone.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1557

NUCLEAR TESTING, FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS NOTES MURUROA TEST--Paris, 7 Jun (TASS)--The Seismological Service of New Zealand has recorded yet another French nuclear test conducted on atoll Mururoa in the South Pacific. An underground nuclear detonation with a yield of two kilotons was set off Saturday night. The FRANCE PRESSE news agency points out that this is already the third nuclear test conducted there since the beginning of the year. France continues nuclear explosions on the atoll in the Pacific Ocean despite all calls by the countries of the region which come out in favor of making it a nuclear-free zone. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0943 GMT 7 Jun 87 LD] /9738

SEMIPALATINSK MILITARY TEST--Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)--The Soviet Union detonated a underground nuclear explosion within the range of 20 to 150 kilotons at the Semipalatinsk test site today at 5 a.m. Moscow time [0100 GMT]. The test was carried out with a view to upgrading military technology. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0208 GMT 20 Jun 87 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1557

USSR: WORLD WOMEN'S CONGRESS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS IN MOSCOW

Congress Opens

LD230749 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0655 GMT 23 Jun 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The World Women's Congress opened in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow today, under the slogan Without Nuclear Weapons by 2000, for Peace, Equality and Development. [video shows Freda Brown leading way onto platform of Grand Kremlin Palace, followed by Gorbachev; a procession of women dressed in European and non-European dress follows; Gorbachev takes place next to Freda Brown, Raisa Gorbachova and Aleksandra Biryukova also enter to sit in front row of platform party. Camera pans audience]

The delegates gave a warm and cordial greetings to the guests of honor: Comrades Gorbachev, Biryukova, Dobrynin.

The congress was opened by Freda Brown, president of the International Democratic Federation of Women, on behalf of the federation, which initiated the forum. In an introductory address, Freda Brown expressed gratitude for the invitation to Moscow and for the hospitality rendered. She discussed the most topical problems of the women's movement and the tasks confronting it. It is essential to develop cooperation of the female public, Freda Brown emphasized, and to step up activity for women's equality and children's happiness, against the threat of nuclear war. This aim will be served by this congress, which includes envoys from more than 150 countries. Freda Brown called upon the congress delegates to conduct a broad and free dialogue on all problems of concern to women and all people of the world.

Then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed a welcoming address to the congress participants. [video shows Gorbachev mounting rostrum; Dobrynin visible in second row of platform party]

He noted that the goals of this forum are lofty and noble. The fact that the Women's congress is being held in Moscow is being interpreted as a sign of confidence in the peace-loving policy of the Soviet state, he stressed.

Opening Speakers Cited

LD231109 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT 23 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS -- A World Congress of Women opened in the Soviet capital today. Its motto is "Towards 2000 -- Without Nuclear Weapons, for Peace, Equality and Development".

An opening ceremony took place in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, with about 2,300 delegates and numerous representatives of the women of Moscow attending.

Freda Brown, president of the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), said that national women's organisations from 154 countries as well as 78 international organisations were represented at the congress. Delegates continue to arrive in Moscow.

The purpose of the world congress is to attract attention to the problems women encounter. The main of them is how to make the world safer and to reduce the risk of an outbreak of war.

"We have got various political and religious views and a lot of other dissimilarities. But I believe that the congress will show: Our accord is much greater than differences," Freda Brown said.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), addressed those present in a speech of greetings.

U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar conveyed good wishes in a message to the participants in the congress. His message was read out by U.N. Undersecretary-General Margaret Jan Anstee.

Speakers at the opening ceremony also included Margaret Papandreou, chairman of the Women's Union of Greece, Efegenia Martinez (Mexico), president of Women's Association "For Sovereignty and National Integration in Latin America", and Aruna Asaf Ali, a prominent public figure of India.

On a proposal by Ruth Meto, general secretary of the All-Africa Organization of Women, the delegates elected Freda Brown to be the president of the congress, and Zoya Pukhova, chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee, as the vice president of the congress.

Work at commissions and discussion centres began in the afternoon.

Gorbachev Addresses Congress

PM241100 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 87 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Speech of Greetings to the Participants in the World Women's Congress"]

[Excerpts] Esteemed guests! Dear friends and Comrades! I am deeply grateful for the invitation to speak to you. You will probably have had time to observe the attitude of attention, sympathy, and goodwill that Soviet people show toward you, delegates to the congress. This is natural, for your aspirations, your hopes and concerns, are akin to ours, and Soviet people perceive the fact that you are holding your congress in Moscow as a sign of trust in our state's peace-loving policy. [applause]

The aims of your congress -- to preserve life on the planet and make it more just -- are lofty and noble. Today this is also a vital task for world politics. Approaching the 3d millenium, mankind is obliged to fearlessly and soberly weigh a multitude of complex problems. These include the depletion of energy resources; the starvation and poverty of tens of millions even hundreds of millions of people; ecological troubles which affect virtually every country; and dreadful diseases, old and new. But all of these and other problems on an international scale are connected in one way or another with the task of eliminating the threat of nuclear war. There are no roads to mankind's progress outside the movement toward a nuclear-free nonviolent world. There lies the key to coping with the challenges thrown down for us by the complex, dramatic and promising times.

None of us has the power to remove history's savage wars, its rivalry between states, classes, and people, with its ascents and descents of the human spirit, and with all its tragedies and triumphs. But this is the history of a divided mankind; a mankind which did not recognize its common existence.

The time has now come when, despite all the diversity of the modern world, and the unconditional right of every people to independent choice, everyone is obliged to take into account the integral nature of the world community, and to assimilate the fact that it depends on us -- the current generation -- whether life on earth will exist or not. Your congress is an impressive manifestation of the growing awareness of people in different countries of their personal involvement in what happens in the world.

People are tired of the oppressive expectation of catastrophe. The realization is growing that it is possible to ward off the danger if only people stretch their hands out to each other over the inevitable ideological, economic, and political barriers which divide states. I must say that women are more fully, more emotionally, and more urgently aware of the absolute priority of preserving peace above all else. [applause]

The old parable says there are three main values on earth: Our daily bread which gives vital force and health; wisdom found in books which provides a link between eras; and woman who prevents the thread of life from being broken. [applause] The best minds throughout the ages have stressed the peace-making role of woman; her ability to cool down heated heads and to ennoble hardened hearts. It is not surprising that it should be among women, who are destined by nature to preserve and continue the human race, that the idea of peace is today finding its most unselfish, selfless, and numerous defenders.

The energetic and passionate antiwar initiatives and demonstrations by women's organizations and movements have become an inalienable feature of the social and political climate. The international women's movement has noticeably strengthened the potential for peace and goodwill; it has made itself heard. This is a real factor in politics. What women give society, and what they are in a position to give it, depends also on the ability of society to give women real rights, social protection, and give them a sense of their due role in society. [applause]

I would like to single out one issue: the upbringing of the rising generation. A new generation is growing up. It must take over the baton of socialism from the older ones and carry it further. It must be ready to build anew relations in the world which is becoming increasingly interdependent. The woman in the family, in the school, everywhere, bears a tremendous responsibility to ensure that from the early years, the future citizen is brought up to respect his people and their culture, people of other nations and races, in a spirit of respecting their culture and way of life. [applause]

The boys and girls of today will have to live and work tomorrow on one planet in still closer contact than we do. We believe in the success of what has been started. Our society, which has covered a heroic and stern road of struggle for survival in a hostile environment, for the revolutionary transformation of a huge and backward country, is capable of tackling this task too. Although it is of course very complex and we know this. It forces us to rethink much in our past and present. It demands bold, unconventional decisions, the highest responsibility, and truly selfless efforts. We must overcome much within ourselves because, as has been said more than once, we are all people of our own time and it is not that simple for us to come around to the new way of thinking. It did not just arise from the requirement to solve things in a modern way and to solve our internal problems thoroughly. It is a search for a response to the challenge the likes of which we have not previously met. The end of the 20th century has become a turning point in the history of civilization. The unprecedented development of science and technology has brought about a qualitative revolution in military affairs. People have acquired weapons that are capable -- even if only a few of them are exploded -- of turning our planet into ashes.

It has become a priority task to stop this from happening. But there is also another side here. It is immoral to delight in scientific and technical progress while closing one's eyes to the fact that it is only a small part of the earth's inhabitants that enjoys its fruits. Hundreds of millions of people do not eat their fill, are unable to read and write, and have no roof over their head. The most monstrous thing is that children are dying every day from emaciation, from disease, from lack of what is most essential, and this at the end of the 20th century, the age of electronics and the "green revolutions," the age of space flights, and truly limitless possibilities for feeding, clothing, and teaching several thousands of millions of people.

However, it is not simply that these possibilities are being used badly and to a small extent: Imperialism is directing them against man, and that is why, on account of the arms race that has been imposed by it, scientific and technical progress is still costing people too dearly. [paragraph continues]

The gap is growing between the small number of developed states and the dozens of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Their financial indebtedness has reached catastrophic proportions, and this is nothing other than the consequence of the egoistical and truly plunderous activity of the banks and corporations of the capitalist North. As a result, the dangers for the whole of mankind being engendered by unequal exchange and the exploitation of the remainder of the world are already comparable with the universal nuclear and ecological threat. In other words, disarmament for development, confidence, and cooperation are the three fundamentals upon which alone it is possible to move into the future. There is no alternative now. [applause]

An understanding of this is penetrating the broad masses and the politically influential spheres. That is the main thing. It is being transformed into active positions, into organized actions against the arms race, and in support of specific initiatives, making it possible to reach agreement on lowering the military threat.

Reminders to governments about their responsibilities grow into a demonstration of a lack of trust in those who avoid their responsibilities, who are unwilling, as before, to reckon with the realities. It is getting increasingly difficult to intimidate using the "Soviet threat," to use it to justify an arms race, and the protraction of talks. There are forces in the world, and you know about them, for whom such changes are not to their liking. These forces are already acting to erect barriers to the process of trust in international relations. Over the past 2 years, the Soviet Union has submitted proposals on virtually every issue of disarmament. What we hear in response is without exception: "Good, but let the Soviets back up their words with deeds." Let me say this: It is not only we who need a realistic policy; it is needed by all states and by all peoples, including the Americans. It presupposes, at the very least, a serious attitude to proposals from the other side, how constructive they are, whether they take the partner's interests, public opinion, and the conclusions of science into account. [applause].

Alas! In response to our initiatives, we receive, as a rule, either an instant rejection or a dogmatic reassertion of old positions. That is to say, something is awry here concerning realism in policy, while the world needs and demands a policy of realistic deeds. If one takes an honest look at the relationship between word and deed in East-West relations, what picture do you get? The Soviet Union, guided by new thinking, builds its foreign policy in such a way as to halt the arms race, eliminate the nuclear threat, and improve the situation. The United States continues to count on force of arms and expansion of the sphere of military rivalry, including space. The Soviet Union maintained a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests for 18 months -- that is deed, not words. The United States also responded with deeds by stepping up explosions in Nevada. On 15 January 1986, the Soviet Union submitted a program for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons and other mass destruction weapons by the end of the century. What was the reply? That peace without nuclear weapons is altogether impossible, that this is a Utopia; and they again vowed allegiance to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

We have stopped the production of chemical weapons and are building a facility to destroy them. This is action and not mere words. How does NATO respond? With plans to manufacture and deploy binary weapons. [applause] It is thanks to the fact that the USSR has indeed proved its readiness to take account of its partners' unease that a positive outcome of the Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures has become possible.

The Reykjavik meeting that we proposed could have marked an historic turning point in disarmament matters but the dramatic dialogue did not end in accord. The decisive step was not taken because for the United States it would have meant rejecting preparations for Star Wars and of the policy of military-strategic superiority over the USSR. How much rumpus, past and present, is there over verification? The USSR has, both publicly and at the negotiating table, spoken out in favor of the strictest verification measures, including international measures and onsite inspection. What of the West? Again speeches about the importance of verification, but now accompanied by reservations -- the idea of which is to protect private military business -- and bases on other people's territory against it.

When the public, political figures, and scientists asked us to separate medium-range missiles from the Reykjavik package, we responded with action. We went that far. Moreover, we also agreed to eliminate operational and tactical missiles in Europe. After many months of delay and argument, the NATO members seemed to give a positive reply but subsequent elucidation both in statements and via diplomatic channels make one wary. Again, as many times before, we are seeing attempts to back down from what was agreed between Moscow and Washington at the political level. Again demands are being put before us that contradict the principles of equal security. The deference shown to the incorrigible militarists, who have no desire to come to terms with the possibility that a first agreement on nuclear disarmament may be concluded, indicates the very great dependence of the U.S. Administration on militaristic groups. As it happens, the first anniversary of the Budapest initiative of the Warsaw Pact countries fell in June. They proposed to NATO that they should look into questions of conventional arms and armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals; sit down at the negotiating table and agree to cut both by one-quarter at the beginning of the nineties, and cut an additional quarter afterward. In response, the NATO countries started talking about the necessity of investing more money in the production and improvement of conventional arms.

A month ago, at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin the members clearly laid out their military doctrine which is devoted to the task of preventing both nuclear and conventional war and is targeted at a reasonable sufficiency in the volume and type of arms and armed forces and is designed exclusively for defensive aims. They invited NATO to discuss and compare at a high level the doctrines of the two blocs and agree on ruling out the actual military-technical possibility of attacking one another. We have not received a clear answer. But speculation about the USSR's alleged superiority in conventional arms has been increased.

The day before yesterday, chatting to journalists at the polling place I said the USSR will go on taking real steps to seek solutions on the path to disarmament. But our partners in the West must also do something and not simply engage in thinking up further demands on us to test our patience. [applause] That is the situation. These are the words and deeds. I had to tell you about this because any peace movement in our time cannot ignore the concrete facts of military danger at any given moment. That is precisely why the professional organizations of scientists, doctors, and ex-soldiers have now gained such weight on the scales of peace and war.

Their authority has enabled them to already become a factor that cannot be eliminated in the current disposition of forces.

World politics, one may say, is also being tested by restructuring. In that restructuring, as in ours, there are many champions, and many sincere supporters. It has stirred many to think about things seriously.

Dear friends! The composition of the participants in your congress is unprecedentedly broad and prestigious, confirming that women have seriously taken up the cause of peace. They comprise a great and inspiring force, a creative and beautiful force! [applause]

This strengthens the conviction that peace is not a utopia, and that if we, the men and women of world, act energetically and together, we shall surely preserve it. [applause]

Esteemed Mrs Brown! Esteemed participants of the congress! You can be completely sure of the one thing: Soviet people are deeply devoted to the cause of peace and friendship between peoples. I would like you to depart from Moscow with this feeling, and hope that never leaves you. [applause] I wish you and your movement and congress success. [applause]

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ADDRESSES UN INSTITUTE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY

LD101929 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 10 Jun 87

[Text] Geneva, 10 Jul (TASS)--A meeting held in the Palace of Nations here on the initiative of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Problems Study discussed the concept of a comprehensive system of international security. The participants in the meeting, among them prominent diplomats, noted scientists, journalists, representatives of the public, were addressed by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy. He gave an extensive characteristic of the concept of a comprehensive system of international security as a concrete manifestation of new political thinking, the highest degree of the philosophy of world politics which holds human values preeminent.

He stressed that the principled "foundations of a comprehensive system of international security" formulated by the 27th congress of the CPSU propose that peaceful coexistence be made the supreme universal principle of international relations. A truly revolutionary change of political consciousness will be needed for this. The notorious concept of "nuclear deterrence", the existing views of force as the basis of security, stereotyped categories of enemy with regard to other countries and peoples should be discarded.

A broad political dialogue on questions of creating a comprehensive system of international peace and security that was started in the United Nations on the initiative of socialist countries is an important step in this direction. In the process of that dialogue, the states should rise above differences and egoistic interests and start acting as partners in the defense and development of civilization, compete in steps toward peace, instead of the arms race. The formulation of the foundations of security in the military, political, economic, humanitarian and ecological areas would make it possible to get rid of the "balance of fear" and create the balance of reason, confidence and goodwill, the USSR representative said.

Socialist countries propose to all their partners in the international arena to enter the 21st century without nuclear arms, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, being guided by new political thinking. New political thinking is, naturally, not just correcting the positions once, but a method of conducting international affairs, a project of practical actions for

the sake of the survival of humanity. The Soviet Union, socialist countries, are prepared to act in such a way, the USSR deputy foreign minister stressed in conclusion. The new evidence of this are the decisions of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states held recently in Berlin, and, specifically, the proposal to NATO countries to hold consultations on questions connected with the military doctrine.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE 11 JUNE

Publication of Disarmament Yearbook

LD112135 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jun 87

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held today in the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was linked to the publication of the "Disarmament and Security" ('razoruzhenkiye i bezopasnost') year book, which is compiled by the Novosti Press Agency and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations. Introducing the publication, Academic [as heard] Primakov said inter alia:

[Begin Primakov recording] There has long been a need for such a publication, and this, in our view, is due to the fact that matters relating to preventing war and strengthening universal peace now undoubtedly occupy a central place. The aim of our yearbook is to cover the main events which have occurred over the year in this most important sphere--a sphere where, in the fullest sense of the word, mankind's destiny is being decided. The state of affairs in the sphere of disarmament and security is probably the most dynamic sphere. [as heard]

This connected with the rapid changes at the talks on arms limitation and reduction, with shifts in the international political situation and the domestic political situation of a number of countries, and also with the mobility--and I would like to stress this in particular--of many parameters of the global military balance.

The growing flow of information on these matters needs to be assimilated and analyzed, and the annual publication should provide just such an opportunity to focus attention on the most important aspects of disarmament and of ensuring security. [end recording]

Questions-Answer Session

PM151347 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Kuvshinnikov article: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"-- passages between slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists has taken place in Moscow at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. The person conducting it--B.D. Pyadyshev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration--reported that although it was devoted to the publication of the first two volumes of the annual publication "Disarmament and Security," its participants were also open to other questions on international themes.

The annual publication is prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute in cooperation with the Novosti news agency. Questions of averting war and strengthening universal peace, Academician Ye. M. Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute, stressed in his address, undoubtedly now occupy a central place in world politics. The aim of the publication is to illuminate the most important events which have taken place in this sphere during the year. Fundamental stress in the annual publication is laid on the military and political aspects of international security, that is, on questions of limiting, reducing, and banning arms and lowering the level of military confrontation.

V.M. Falin, chairman of the APN Board, explained that the annual publication is published in Russian and English. It will be distributed by subscription, which can be organized through APN or through the World Economics and International Relations Institute.

Then the press conference participants answered numerous questions from Soviet and foreign journalists. In particular, the correspondents were interested in /precisely what changes were made to the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine at the Berlin Political Consultative Committee Conference./

Preventing a new war, both nuclear and conventional, rather than securing victory if a war were nevertheless to flare up is now defined as the main task, Ye.M. Primakov explained. Furthermore, the Warsaw Pact Organization announced that it will never be the first to use either conventional or nuclear weapons, and that its military doctrine is defensive. This is very important inasmuch as the first strike has traditionally been regarded as a most important precondition for victory in war.

In my personal opinion, Academician Primakov said further, the arms race and the rules of this race were forced upon us over a certain period. We followed the United States because we were compelled to. Seeing this, certain circles in the United States tried to use this race to wear us out economically. The Berlin conference took the decision to base military planning on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. Maneuvers directed at bleeding the Soviet Union dry by means of an arms race are thereby hampered.

A correspondent of the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO asked /whether the concept of nuclear deterrence would remain the basis of security until nuclear weapons are eliminated./

In reply Ye.M. Primakov stressed that Soviet criticism of this concept is based on the fact that the very principle of deterrence involving fear is amoral. But until nuclear weapons are completely eliminated, deterrence will remain the basis of strategic equilibrium. Although at the same time political means to ensure security must increasingly be pushed to the fore.

A correspondent from a West German newspaper put a question /concerning the USSR's position on the Pershing-1A operational and tactical missiles in service with the Bundeswehr but possessing U.S. nuclear warheads./

In reply V.M. Falin explained that at the Geneva talks the question of these missiles has not been raised since they belong to the FRG. It is the elimination of the 72 U.S. warheads allotted to them that is being discussed at the talks. If it is a question of the destruction of Soviet and U.S. warheads on medium-range and operational and tactical delivery vehicles, then there cannot be any exceptions for one of the sides.

/"With which government in Britain would it be easier for you to deal on questions of disarmament, a labor one or a conservative one?"/ a correspondent from the London television company ITN inquired. In reply, it was indicated to him that such a question would signify an attempt to provoke interference in Britain's internal affairs.

/A series of questions concerned the situation in the Persian Gulf./ In reply to them it was stressed that it has been exacerbated by the Iran-Iraq war, which the United States is trying to use for its own ends.

/Replying to questions on the progress of the investigation of the case of the West German pilot M. Rust,/ a Foreign Ministry spokesman said that attempts are still being made to establish whether his audacious flight was really a "single-engine" adventure, or whether he was driven by some other, secret "engine." It was noted that Rust has not made a single complaint about the way the investigation is being conducted or the conditions in which he is being detained.

It was reported at the press conference that a statement has been made to the Japanese ambassador to the USSR in connection with the continuing unfriendly campaign in Japan concerning certain officials in Soviet establishments. At the same time it was pointed out to him that certain representatives of the Japanese embassy to the USSR are carrying out unlawful acts incompatible with their status. It was stressed that in the event of the continuing whipping up of an unhealthy situation around Soviet establishments in Japan, the Soviet Union would be forced to take corresponding countermeasures against them. A correspondent from the Japanese newspaper ASAHI /asked for clarification about who and precisely what measures would be involved./ In reply it was stated that in any case they do not affect journalists.

Military Doctrine Discussed

PM171501 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the rubric "Across Countries and Continents": "Disarmament and Security"]

[Text] The first two volumes of the year book "Disarmament and Security" prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations in conjunction with the Novosti press agency have been published. A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 11 June in this connection. Academician Ye.M. Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, and V.M. Falin, chairman of the Novosti board, took part.

It was noted that the urgent need for such a publication is dictated by the fact that the questions of preventing war and strengthening universal peace now occupy a central place in international policy. The regular publication of the year will make it possible to follow the state of affairs on a constant, long-term basis and reveal and make use of the regular pattern in this sphere.

Correspondents' questions were answered.

[Unidentified correspondent] What new ideas in Soviet military doctrine were introduced at the Berlin Political Consultative Committee conference in comparison to the old doctrine?

[Unidentified respondent] The difference with the current military doctrine is that it clearly states that the main task of the Warsaw Pact armed forces and military policy is to prevent a new war, both nuclear and conventional, rather than to guarantee victory. In accordance with the document approved in Berlin, the Warsaw Pact will never be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons. This is very important, because the first strike is traditionally regarded as the most important precondition of victory in war. Then: All military planning and all military building will be based on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. This means that the necessary quantity and quality of the means which can restrain the opposite side and guarantee state security if war should nevertheless break out will be determined.

Journalists showed an interest in assessments of the Venice meeting of "the seven."

[Unidentified respondent] First impressions vary, but on the whole the meeting is considered more interesting than the previous 12 meetings of the leaders of the main capitalist countries. On the one hand, a final document of "the seven" on "East-West" issues has a comparatively calm, nonconfrontational tone.

Perhaps for the first time in the history of these meetings between the Western leaders, they make the positive observation that "new possibilities have appeared for progress in East-West relations." On the other hand--and this certainly cannot be considered to the credit of the meeting--the

traditionally unconstructive attitude to a whole range of issues still prevailed. Washington's imperial thinking shows through many of the provisions contained in the Venice documents. We are in no hurry to express our disappointment regarding the approach of "the seven" to the disarmament problem. Unfortunately, this subject was only discussed in general terms and there was not even found room to mention the problem of medium-range missiles or the question of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. This gap was filled to a certain extent, it is true, by the U.S. secretary of state's statement. At the end of the meeting G. Shultz noted that an "increasing consensus" had been reached in Venice "regarding medium-range missiles" and that the disagreement issue, including medium-range missiles, would be the subject of deeper discussion and coordination at the NATO Council session opening today in Reykjavik.

[Unidentified correspondent] How is freedom of navigation now being ensured in the Persian Gulf, where a complex situation is taking shape?

[Unidentified respondent] The longest war of the 20th century--between Iran and Iraq--is at the root of this situation. Unfortunately, there are no real opportunities to stop it immediately. The USSR is doing everything it can to end the war. The United States, on the other hand, is using the conflict in its own interests. With the United States building up its military presence in the Persian Gulf, it is not simply a question of freedom of navigation. The Soviet side is sticking closely to the line which can be summed up as follows: The bloody conflict must be ended. Only those forces interested in imposing their will are gaining from this conflict and certainly not any of the peoples in this region.

[Unidentified correspondent] Is there a connection between disarmament and regional conflicts, can regional conflicts hamper progress in disarmament, or, on the contrary, can disarmament help to resolve these conflicts?

[Unidentified respondent] The question of a correlation between disarmament and regional conflicts is not far-fetched. Even before Geneva the American side showed a desire to postpone the subject of disarmament and bring forward confidence-building measures, including those which could be implemented in the task of eliminating regional conflicts. The Soviet position has always been that it is essential to resolve all issues. But the main aspect of stabilizing the international situation is, of course, the task of ending the arms race.

Journalists were told at the press conference that on 10 June the Japanese ambassador to the USSR was given a statement in connection with the continuing unfriendly campaign in Japan against certain members of Soviet establishments. It was pointed out to the ambassador at the same time that some Japanese representatives, including members of the embassy, are engaging in unlawful acts in the Soviet Union that are incompatible with their official status. It was stressed that in the event of a continued buildup of the unhealthy situation surrounding Soviet establishments in Japan and unlawful actions by Japanese representatives in the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union will be forced to take appropriate countermeasures. Other questions were also answered.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

NEW SOVIET BOOK ON DISARMAMENT ISSUES PUBLISHED

LD180630 Moscow TASS in English 0557 GMT 18 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow, June 18 TASS—The newspaper PRAVDA today reviewed a Russian-language book called "Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Studies. 1987" brought out by Nauka (science) publishers.

The 544-page book opens with an article by Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, headlined "For a World Without Nuclear Arms, Towards the 21st Century."

"There is perhaps no problem of disarmament that is not covered by articles and other material included in the book. It speaks of the problem of banning nuclear weapons testing, their reduction and subsequent complete elimination, the problem of destroying chemical and bacteriological weapons, the renunciation of the use of force in relations between states and peoples, cuts in conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, the creation of nuclear-free zones, and many other issues," PRAVDA said.

The book includes a series of articles devoted to the problem of preventing outer space militarization and the need for peaceful cooperation in the exploration of outer space.

"The indepth analysis of the reasons why the U.S. military-industrial complex and the present White House administration are banking on the placement of American strike weapons in outer space prompts the unequivocal conclusion that the 'star wars' program is fraught with a mortal danger to mankind. An insurmountable barrier must be erected in its way," PRAVDA said.

"Other military-political programs of Washington and its NATO parties, which are only helping aggravate the international situation and pushing mankind to the brink of nuclear war, are also subjected to critical analysis. The Soviet scientists stress the need to thwart imperialism's aggressive ambitions decisively," it added.

"The greatest merit of the studies on the issues of peace and disarmament included in the book under review is that they are based on rich factual

material and a philosophical analysis and generalization of the practical activities of the Soviet state, mass organizations and broadest sections of our people in the interest of enhancing peace and international security," the paper said.

It added that the book, which is the latest publication of the Scientific Council for Studying the Problems of Peace and Disarmament, called for achieving the noble aim of "disarmament for peace" meeting the vital interests of all nations.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1572

PEREZ DE CUELLAR VISITS MOSCOW

Meets Gorbachev

PM301102 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 87 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With J. Perez de Cuellar"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met with Javier Perez de Cuellar in the Kremlin 29 June.

Welcoming the United Nations secretary-general, Gorbachev expressed the Soviet Union's invariable respect for the UN's work. The organization had done much in the past and its role would be growing. The speculations that the UN was declining and losing face were totally unacceptable.

The world situation had changed over the past 40 years. More than a hundred new nations entered the international scene. The world was saturated with interests, and it was the task of tasks to find balance between them.

The UN, possessing immense experience, both successful and unsuccessful, was the best suitable body for that. Without achieving a balance of diverse interests there would be no stability in international relations.

The new situation was knocking at the UN doors. The organization, naturally, was looking for a qualitatively new role to play, difficult as it were.

Time is past when peace could be established by subordinating it to the interests of one or several powers. At present, even if something happened to a small nation, all were reacting. Nothing could be accomplished any longer without recognizing the right of all to choice, to sovereignty, to independent use of their resources and participation in international affairs.

This conclusion was organically included in a concept which the CPSU and the Soviet leadership had thoroughly thought out and were seeking to translate into policy for two years.

"Not everything has been accomplished. But we see it is evoking growing understanding and response in the world. We are convinced we have adopted a correct path which we are going to consistently follow."

Agreeing with his interlocutor's idea that the duties of the leaders of major countries included generating a new atmosphere in the world, Gorbachev recalled the concept of general security advanced by the 27th CPSU Congress, which comprised not only a military-political aspect but also economic, humanitarian and ecological aspects.

He also recalled the 15 January 1986 blueprint for a nuclear-free world, which had been a result of an indepth analysis and of becoming aware that the world had grown tired of being constantly under the threat of catastrophe, tired of confrontation, and needed a point of support for its hope for a way out of the dangerous situation.

"In that program we have defined the perspective. It specifies both the long-term aid and the phases to be covered on the way to it as well as the middle-term and immediate goals. We have developed our specific initiatives accordingly, inviting everyone to cooperation."

"We have suggested serious compromises and given our partners quite a few chances. This only serves to bear out that we are not playing politics and are not acting vigorously to catch somebody's fancy or make a propaganda gain, but are faithful to our peaceful line and realize that time may not be wasted any longer and that someone must set an example by action."

"We also realize that the clearer the outlines of possible agreements, for example those on medium-range missiles and chemical weapons, the greater resistance from militarist groups. But it is politicians' business to break it down. As for the economic aspect and the interests of nations, it is not only feasible but wholesome to get rid of dictates by the military element in industry."

The interlocutors agreed that science was now entering politics not only through military technology but also through social thinking by concerned scientists. It is a vast potential for peace, and constitutes the more competent part of world, public opinion. It is at the disposal of mankind and hence of the United Nations.

Gorbachev expressed gratitude to the U.N. secretary-general for his support to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing and reaffirmed that the USSR was prepared to resume the moratorium if it was joined by the United States.

He also reminded Perez de Cuellar of the "Group of Six"'s initiative and of the fact that the Soviet Union agreed to challenge inspections and was prepared even right now to send its representatives to full-scale talks on a ban on testing, during which it would also be possible to deal with the issue of ratifying the 1974 and 1976 treaties and take account of the U.S. Congress's ideas about reducing the yields and numbers of explosions.

Gorbachev explained the "key provisions" which had been discussed during George Shultz' visit to Moscow, pointing out that keeping arms out of space remained the Soviet Union's sine qua non condition. The United Nations is also called upon to play its role in this area because outer space is mankind's common property and caring for it is a direct duty of the world organization.

The problem of disarmament and development was discussed in detail. The position definitely taken by the Nonaligned Movement has become an important factor in the field. The Soviet Union is preparing new proposals on this problem which affects practically the whole world. What is needed is aboveboard and judicious cooperation

rather than shirking the substance of the matter in a bid to preserve the mechanism of unequal exchanges and exploitation. To put off a solution means to make mankind face a very serious danger: A combustible material of great power comparable with the nuclear threat is fast being accumulated.

Perez de Cuellar expressed profound concern over the developments in the Persian Gulf, told the Soviet side about the intentions of the Security Council, his personal efforts, appealed to cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States in the face of the threat of the war's expansion.

Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed the Soviet Union's interest that the conflict should not spread and that the long-drawn-out pointless Iran-Iraq war should finally be stopped. He told the United Nations secretary-general about the efforts taken by the Soviet Government. "We shall be acting with a sense of responsibility," he said. "Let us consider what we can do in the existing situation and what can be done by the Security Council."

When the Middle East crisis was discussed, the sides analysed problems and obstacles to the only possible mode of settlement, through an international conference with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and all the parties immediately concerned. A great degree of closeness of the approaches to the nature and tasks of the conference were noted. The entire process of settlement and its concluding stage should have a constructive nature, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Recrimination would be of no avail. What is needed are just solutions to all questions, taking into account the interests of both the Arabs and of Israel, and, of course, guarantees are also needed.

The Afghan problem was discussed. The efforts of the personal envoy of the United Nations secretary-general were commended. The interlocutors noted that the process of the settlement in both its internal and external aspects had started. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the hope that it could yield a result not in the remote future but in the near future. "Our only wish is that Afghanistan should be a neutral and independent state friendly to the USSR and not a base for hostile activity threatening the security of neighbours," he said.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Perez de Cuellar expressed satisfaction with a friendly conversation which reaffirmed the existence of vast opportunities for interaction between the USSR and the United Nations Organization, the common concerns about peace and a profound realization of the responsibility for safeguarding it.

Eduard Shevardnadze took part in the conversation.

Meets Officials, Receives Medal

PM301443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 6

["Presentation of UN Commemorative Medal"]

[Text] In the Kremlin 29 June, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, had a meeting with UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar. Taking part in the meeting were Comrade Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Marrack Goulding, Diego Cordovez and V.S. Safronchuk, members of the Commission for holding the UN Year in the USSR and the International Peace Year, deputy UN secretaries general; other officials.

A memorial medal of the United Nations to mark the International Peace Year was presented. It was taken by Comrade Gromyko as chairman of the Commission for holding the UN Year in the USSR and the International Peace Year.

During the presentation of the medal Perez de Cuellar made a speech. By a happy coincidence, he noted, the chairman of the Soviet Commission for holding the International Peace Year is also the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The fact that one of the highest leaders of a state, and one of those who signed the UN Charter, took a personal part in the work of the commission is another confirmation of the importance which the people of the Soviet Union ascribe to the program of the peace year.

Interdependence from the point of view of security is an inalienable part of the reality of the contemporary world. The authors of the UN Charter, showing perspicacity, guested in advance the manifestation of such a requirement, and foresaw the creation and maintaining by all members of the United Nations of a system of international security. He noted that during the holding of the International Peace Year, the Soviet Union and other socialist states proposed the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security. This initiative was directed toward the implementation of the aims and principles of the United Nations, and the utilization of the whole potential of the UN charter in the cause of maintaining peace and security by working out mutual guarantees on all aspects of interstate relations.

The public meeting and gatherings held in the Soviet Union in 1986 clearly showed that the Soviet Union has a profound interest in peace and disarmament and eliminating nuclear weapons.

In presenting you with this medal, we sincerely value the contribution which was made by the commission under your leadership to the cause of coordinating the holding of the International Peace Year. The medal is also being presented with the hope that the spirit of 1986, and also adherence to its ideals will continue in tireless and long-term efforts aimed at achieving peace.

A reply speech was made by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. He said:

We assess the handing over to you to the National Commission for holding the International Peace Year in the USSR of this medal of honor as a recognition of the enormous contribution with the Soviet Union is making to the cause of strengthening peace.

Our state was among the first to respond to the appeal of the UN General Assembly to mark 1986 as an International Peace Year. At a joint session of the Commissions for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet in January 1986 a declaration was adopted welcoming the decision of the General Assembly to declare 1986 an International Year of Peace, and expressing support for its basic aims.

In the very first month of the International Year, the Soviet Union put forward an historic initiative on creating a nuclear-free world. The statement by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 put forward proposals for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, for prevention of an arms race in space, for banning and elimination of chemical weapons, and for reductions in conventional weapons. Together with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union submitted to the 41st session of the UN General Assembly a proposal for the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security. It gained broad international approval, and will be the subject of further examination at the coming session of the assembly. It is only the U.S. adherence to the "Star Wars" program that prevented the embodiment of what was achieved in Reykjavik in an agreement.

Many events devoted to the International Peace Year were staged in the Soviet Union itself, as well. The Soviet Union unflinchingly wages a struggle for peace. Continuing these efforts, this year our country has now proposed the complete elimination of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. I would like to express the hope that the talks on this issue will lead to an agreement.

Work on restructuring the nation's economy and society is organically linked with the peace-loving foreign policy. This was reaffirmed by the CPSU Central Committee plenum which has just been held. Of course, there are in the world very influential forces which would like peoples to come to terms with the arms race, and with the terrible military danger. These forces gave a hostile reception to the noble aims for the International Peace Year as well. You, Mr Secretary General, know well how they received these ideas and proposals. But we are in no doubt that all the obstacles must and, most importantly, can be overcome, if the peoples and their governments, true to the aims and principles of the UN Charter, act energetically, resolutely and cohesively. Our people consider that the noble aims of the Peace Year must continue to be the basis of actions by UN member states and by all peace-loving forces, and should serve as a reference point for them both this year and in subsequent years. The United Nations could make a substantial contribution to the construction of a nuclear-free and non-violent world.

Your personal contribution to the United Nations's activities is highly valued in the Soviet Union, and we wish you success, pay due tribute to your role in the solution of the complex tasks facing the organization. I would like to assure you, Mr Secretary General, that the Soviet Union, adhering firmly to the aims and principles of the International Peace Year, will continue to give every assistance to the enhancement of the effectiveness of the United Nations as an efficacious instrument for the guaranteeing of peace and international security.

The speeches by Perez de Cuellar and Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko were received with applause.

Following the presentation of the memorial medal, a conversation was held between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and Perez de Cuellar, in which Comrades Yakovlev, Demichev and Petrovskiy, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs, and M. Goulding, D. Cordovez, and V.S. Safronchuk took part. During the conversation issues were discussed connected with today's international situation and with the need to enhance the United Nation's role in the struggle for consolidation of peace and for the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. On the Soviet side, it was noted that our country has always attached great importance to the United Nations as an instrument for the support of peace and as an organization which can, and should, become something which guarantees peace.

Presents Medal to Gromyko

LD291503 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 29 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- The United Nations secretary-general presented a U.N. Medal marking International Year of Peace to Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the Kremlin today.

Javier Perez de Cuellar is in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Receives Moscow University Degree

LD291239 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 29 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- A medal and a diploma of doctor emeritus of Moscow State University were presented to Javier Perez de Cuellar, the United Nations secretary-general, in a ceremony today.

The ceremony took place in the university building on Lenin Hills in the presence of scientists and students of the country's oldest higher educational establishment founded in the 18th century by Mikhail Lomonosov, a great Russian scientist.

Addressing Javier Perez de Cuellar, Anatoliy Logunov, rector of the Moscow State University, praised his contribution as a lawyer to the development of the science of law and his fruitful work as the United Nations secretary-general.

"Soviet people," he said, "support the activities of the United Nations. They highly value the personal contribution made by the secretary-general to the drafting and adoption of a series of important documents of the United Nations."

Presenting the medal and the diploma, Anatoliy Logunov asked the United Nations secretary-general two traditional questions: "are you prepared to uphold the ideals of peace and friendship among nations?" and "are you prepared always to promote the progress of science.?"

The answer was laconic -- "yes". Javier Perez de Cuellar said that he regarded the medal and the diploma as the recognition of the activities of the United Nations.

He said that while staying in the university he was thinking of students and youth to whom future belonged and emphasized that the common task of all was to preserve peace for the future generations.

The secretary-general spoke of the lofty role of the United Nations in strengthening peace and resolving disarmament problems.

He said that dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States on key issues of world politics was promising.

There are no problems in the world which cannot be resolved by peaceful means, the United Nations secretary-general said. He wished scientists and students success in developing science and directing it to the service of peace.

The United Nations secretary-general is staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Attends Dinner, Speaks

PM011035 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report under general heading: "UN Secretary General in USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze gave a dinner in honor of the UN secretary general at which there was an exchange of short speeches.

Welcoming J. Perez de Cuellar's visit to the Soviet Union, the USSR foreign minister stressed that the United Nations and its secretary general can invariably count on active, firm support from the Soviet side in all missions and ventures undertaken in accordance with the lofty goals and principles of the UN Charter. He recalled M.S. Gorbachev's statement regarding the Soviet Union's readiness to do everything to enhance the United Nations' prestige and to strengthen its political, legal, and moral status in international affairs and above all informing states' new political thinking and modus operandi.

The Soviet Union has suggested the concept of transferring to a nuclear-free nonviolent world, which is an inalienable part of the socialist states' joint initiative for creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

Security and nuclear weapons are incompatible concepts. It is axiomatic that the existence of nuclear weapons is preventing the United Nations from effectively undertaking actions with regard to the threat to peace, violations of peace, and acts of aggression.

The Soviet Union, which has nuclear weapons, is prepared, to put it simply, to replace the illusion of security with a guarantee of security for itself and for all which the United Nations provides on the basis of the provisions of its charter, backed up by an all-embracing system of peace and international security elaborated with the general consensus of all UN states.

We are convinced that this accords with the interests of all states, accords with the genuine democratization of international relations, consolidates the principle of states' collective security, and asserts faith in basic human rights, in the dignity and value of the individual person, and in equal rights for great and small nations.

It seems to us that an all-embracing system of international peace and security can be asserted only on the basis of a sharp increase in the role and responsibility of the United Nations and all its institutions, primarily the Security Council, General Assembly, specialized organs, secretariat, and general secretariat. As you can see, there is a great amount of feedback here: In asserting this system the United Nations will be improved as the main guarantee of a nuclear-free nonviolent world.

For his part, J. Perez de Cuellar noted that Soviet people's cordiality and hospitality are a confirmation of their unvarying and growing support for the United Nations' activity. There is scarcely any need to say much about how the Soviet Union, as one of the main founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, is playing a very important role in promoting this worldwide organization's fulfillment of its mandate and its implementation of its broad potential. There is no doubt that all countries are vitally interested in peace and in creating a reliable system of international security. But the main responsibility for this invariably rests with the most powerful states. Open dialogue between the great powers and the display by each of equal respect for the interests and requirements of the other UN states promote the creation of a climate of trust. It is in this climate that fruitful initiatives become possible for resolving both global and regional problems.

I value General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's frequent calls for the consolidation of the United Nations' political, legal, and moral prestige and for the better use of its procedures for settling disputes. It is to be hoped that these calls will lead to specific results.

The meeting in Reykjavik highlighted possibilities for a radical reduction in nuclear arsenals -- possibilities which have frequently been ignored in the past as being unrealistic.

The Soviet Union has come out with initiatives which, together with the reaction they are generating, are helping to overcome the psychological barrier on the path to halting the nuclear arms race.

It may be noted with satisfaction that promising changes have been noted in international affairs in the course of the year which the General Assembly has proclaimed the year of peace.

I hope this has also helped the peoples to see again in the UN Charter a lodestar which can show mankind the way to a secure future.

With J. Perez de Cuellar at the dinner were the officials accompanying him on his trip.

A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, and leaders of a number of ministries, departments, and public organizations were present on the Soviet side.

Addresses TV Audience

LD011757 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1455 GMT 1 Jul 87

[Speech by UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar--live or recorded; date and place not given; in English, fading into Russian translation; screen caption reads "Address on Soviet Television by J. Perez De Cuellar, UN Secretary General"]

[Text] I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Soviet people directly in connection with my official visit to your country. This visit has been very constructive and useful. I have had very positive talks with General Secretary Gorbachev, and with other Soviet leaders.

Soon you will celebrate the 70th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet state, a state that came into being amid the destruction wrought by World War I, and plunged a little more than 2 decades later into another and even more destructive world conflict. Thanks to the extraordinary bravery and steadfastness of the Soviet people, and at the price of the sacrifices they made, victory was won. However, even today, one is hardly capable of comprehending what that victory cost in human lives, suffering, and destruction. Having felt directly all the horrors of war, Soviet people each of you, I know, is determined to strive for peace. This is the chief aim for which the UN was created, and it remains as its chief task.

The Soviet Government played a most important role in the creation of this world organization as a means to guarantee peace for the Soviet people and for all people on Earth.

History shows that chasing unilaterally after one's own national interests, without taking due account of other states interests, gives rise to distrust and conflicts. The UN's founders wanted to put international relations on a different footing. They understood that to ensure lasting peace for all nations, we must cooperate with each other to resolve economic, social, and humanitarian problems, and that the settlement of disputes must be implemented through peaceful means, without the use of force. It was assumed that maintenance of international security was the collective responsibility of all UN member countries. Thus, the new political thinking that inspired the writers of the UN Charter was based on two complementary elements in relations between states: first, that states would no longer use force or the threat of force in relation to each other; and second, that taking into account each other's interests and aspirations was just as important as the defense of their own interests. The nonadherence by UN member countries to these basic principles is the prime cause of the difficulties over which our organization stumbles when realizing its potential. The Charter demanded radical change. Perhaps it was overly optimistic to expect such changes to take place in only a few decades.

Nevertheless, quite a lot has been achieved in the last 40 years. Life has reaffirmed the principles of international cooperation that were formulated by the UN's founders. We have managed to avoid a new world war. New signs have emerged in 1986-87 that certain UN members states would like to make greater use of the UN's potential as a constructive force in international affairs.

In the disarmament sphere, forward movement has taken place, as has a great deal of coordination and rapprochement of views on various aspects of limiting and reducing the arms race madness.

I refer to the talks on two important weapons categories, the readiness to rectify the imbalance in conventional weapons in Europe, and the rapprochement of views on the verification issue. It seems that a new realism is being born in the framework of the positive development of East-West relations. This has been brought about by a number of specific factors, including a growing interdependence that runs counter to all forms of unilateral and interventionist policy, the failure of attempts to win the arms race by achieving superiority, and the fact that the latest technological research has not led to the expected results, that is, to the commencement of a post-nuclear age, but instead has introduced elements of destabilization, uncertainty, and financial difficulties. Serious political and technical problems still remain that hinder the attainment of more significant progress in the disarmament field. However, understanding of the problems has grown, since life has not confirmed the suppositions on which the various policies have thus far been built. On the contrary, confrontation on all fronts and an unbridled arms race have brought negative results. Although no solution to the nuclear dilemma has been found, the expected agreement, which seems to be realistic, would be of immense psychological and political value, and would turn Europe into a zone of reduced danger. All this will help assert the new political way of thinking.

In his speech to the Indian parliament on 27 November 1986, General Secretary Gorbachev said, in particular, that only one possible victory exists in the nuclear weapons era, the victory of reason. In other words, a victory in which there are no vanquished and all are victors. If reason prevails, it follows that the logical response to the growing interdependence of the world is a multilateral one, and that the United Nations, which embodies this characteristic and can in no way be considered as experiencing a crisis, should be viewed as an organizational structure for the future settlement of world problems. I am convinced that the enormous problem facing all mankind can be resolved on a genuinely international basis, and that solidarity and mutual trust are possible. This will permit disagreements that arise between states to be eliminated through peaceful means as offered by the UN. I hope that the Soviet people, you and your children, and your children's children, will enjoy the benefits of peace. I know you would also like these benefits to be enjoyed by all other world peoples.

Talks With Shevardnadze

LD301824 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 30 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., and Javier Perez de Cuellar, the United Nations secretary-general, held talks at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. June 29-30 on a broad range of international problems and on the role of the United Nations in promoting their positive solution.

Javier Perez de Cuellar expressed profound satisfaction with his meeting and conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He said that the exchange of views had enlarged and deepened his knowledge of the Soviet Union's foreign policy goals, its constructive role in world affairs and in giving them positive direction.

Eduard Shevardnadze called the attention of the United Nations secretary-general to the Soviet initiatives reflecting the Soviet Union's new approach to concepts of building a nuclear weapon-free world and a system of comprehensive security.

"During the conversations with the Soviet leadership and your tour of the Soviet Union," Eduard Shevardnadze said, "You could see for yourself yet another time the sincere striving of the government and the people of our country for peace and international cooperation in conditions of democracy, freedom and justice. Speaking of its foreign policy aspect, this is the essence of perestroika (restructuring)."

"The interest generated in the Soviet Union by the visit of the United Nations secretary-general," Eduard Shevardnadze went on to say, "reflects what importance is attached in our country to the U.N. The authority of those organizations and personalities who are striving, in their actions, not mere words, for peace, for ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation, terminating the arms race and making international relations more democratic and humane is rapidly growing."

Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized that the acuteness of specific problems facing the international community in various regions of the world and spheres of activity -- military, political, economic, humanitarian and ecological spheres -- dictated the need for all-round efforts of the United Nations and its member-countries along the lines of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security, ensuring its guarantees and dependability.

"This is the aim of the joint initiative submitted to the United Nations for consideration by the Soviet Union together with the group of socialist countries," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

Javier Perez De Cuellar noted that the idea of a comprehensive system of international security that would embrace all spheres of international relations deserved very serious analysis on the part of all states. Concrete proposals on the essence of that concept which the Soviet Union and other co-architects of that initiative are to submit to the 42nd session of the General Assembly will undoubtedly be met with great interest.

During the talks the sides also had a detailed exchange of views on ways for settling U.N.-discussed crises and conflicts in the world.

It was stated that in the Middle East the current sentiment was increasingly in favor of a comprehensive and all-embracing settlement. In this context special attention was devoted to the need for careful preparations for and convocation of an international conference on the Middle East.

Javier Perez de Cuellar expressed the conviction that the international conference should center on the essence of that complex and intricate problem.

The Soviet side expounded the proposal on the establishment of a preparatory committee for the conference and noted that at the beginning the case in point could be a working group. The important thing is that the five permanent members of the Security Council together with United Nations secretary-general should join in practical preparations for the conference.

The sides also discussed in detail and with interest what could be done, in particular with the assistance of the United Nations, to prevent the escalation of the conflict between Iran and Iraq and to bring about an end at long last to that protracted and senseless bloodshed.

The sides took note of the possibilities of using the potential of the Security Council for that purpose.

The discussion of the Afghan problem was concentrated on the review of the commenced process of settlement in all of its aspects, domestic and external. The information was set forth concerning efforts of the personal envoy of the United Nations secretary-general at the Geneva talks on that problem. It was emphasized that the policy of national reconciliation consistently pursued by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Geneva talks were parallel, mutually reinforcing processes.

The Soviet side reaffirmed the determination to promote in every way the process of settlement of the situation related to Afghanistan and expressed support for Afghanistan's proposals and efforts aiming for an early attainment of that goal.

The sides touched on other international problems and on ways for enhancing the efficiency of the United Nations.

Meets With Ryzhkov

LD302250 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1828 GMT 30 Jun

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today received in the Kremlin U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar who is staying in Moscow on an official visit.

Special attention was paid during the meeting to UN tasks in establishing a new international economic order, halting the arms race and switching funds to peaceful development purposes.

Ryzhkov spoke about thorough-going changes in the life of Soviet society, stressing the intrinsic connection between the party's policy of speeding up social and economic progress of the nation and the country's foreign policy of peace.

As he touched on world economic problems, the Soviet head of government said that achieving a new international economic order and the economic security of states was an urgent and quite realistic task. He said it was important to create stable external conditions for equitable and extensive economic cooperation among all countries, socialist and capitalist, developed and developing. A solution to the problem of developing nations' foreign debt, Ryzhkov said, called for persevering efforts from the entire world community and the Soviet Union recently had together with the other Warsaw Treaty countries set forth its views on the issue.

The sides then called for the more important UN decisions on world economic problems to be realized and for the organization to acquire a greater role in the field.

The Soviet side emphasized the pressing need to realize in practice the principle "disarmament for development" and release the enormous funds devoured by the arms race for peaceful development purposes. The militarization of the economy must be countered by peaceful alternatives in the more important scientific and technological fields and joint projects should be launched in the nuclear, space, chemical and other spheres of the civilian economy.

Switching resources from military to civilian needs, including aid to developing countries, and starting cooperation in leading industries would be a powerful factor for fostering trust, an atmosphere of mutual understanding and predictability, Ryzhkov said. The United Nations, he added, was called upon to play an important role in dealing with all those problems.

Ryzhkov and Perez de Cuellar expressed themselves in favor of a successful holding of an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development next August and September and the 7th session of the UN Conference on Trade and Development opening 9 July.

The Soviet head of government pointed to the importance of a program sponsored by the USSR in the United Nations for joint practical activities by states in peaceful space exploration.

The particular topicality was singled out of the USSR proposal to set up a world space organization which could carry out not only coordination of the efforts of states to develop cooperation in the research and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, including the realization of major international projects in this sphere, but also verification [kontrol] of observance of agreements to prevent the arms race in space.

Taking part in the conversation were V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; A.M. Belonogov, USSR permanent representative at the United Nations; and UN under secretaries-general M. Goulding, D. Cordovez, and V.S. Safronchuk.

Holds News Conference

LD301758 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1529 GMT 30 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jun (TASS) -- Throughout the whole of my trip around the USSR, I felt support for the activity of the United Nations. It will inspire me in my work and in my efforts to find peaceful and just solutions to international problems. This was stated by Javier Perez de Cuellar, UN secretary general, speaking today at a news conference in the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry.

Answering correspondent's questions about the situation in the Persian Gulf region, the UN secretary general stressed that the current, main issue is to achieve the ensuring of security in that region, in the interests of preserving peace. He said: At meetings with Soviet leaders I understood that the USSR is following the development of the alarming situation in the Persian Gulf region with the same kind of anxiety. However, we did not discuss any specific ideas. That would be too premature. We must present to the Security Council the opportunity for working out a resolution on resolving such an important international problem.

In a discussion relating to the matter of holding an international conference on the Near East with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, I reported on what is being done by the United Nations in this direction. We share the view that the aim of an international conference should lie in a broad and universal settlement of the problem, and that the conference should fulfill truly diplomatic functions. A Near East settlement should include a solution to the Palestinian problem.

Voicing his opinion on the issue of achieving a political settlement in Afghanistan, the UN secretary general said that the Afghans themselves should follow the national reconciliation policy. The USSR, he noted, is speaking out in favor of a neutral, independent Afghanistan, which will not pursue policies hostile to the Soviet Union. Cordovez, the special representative of the UN secretary general, is studying all possible ways of speeding up a successful conclusion to the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva.

The United Nations is a permanent forum for discussing ways and means of eliminating apartheid, J. Perez de Cuellar stated. I personally actively take part in these efforts, considering that apartheid means a refusal to the overwhelming majority of people in South Africa of their basic human rights. The United Nations will continue to apply more pressure on the South African Government in order that it should put an end to apartheid.

Answering a question on the perspectives of an expansion of the conflict in Central America, the UN secretary general noted that the United Nations is very interested in a peaceful solution to Central American problems. I think we must show patience in that matter since there exists agreement on a meeting of all five heads of Central American states. We hope that after the meeting in Guatemala, the five Latin American republics will find a just solution to the conflict, will take up a position of reconciliation between all the sides, and will be able to come to a solution, taking into account the interests of all countries of the region, without any kind of external interference.

Ends Moscow Visit

LD010624 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 1 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- U.N. Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar departed from Moscow today. He stayed in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government. At the airport he was seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister, and other officials.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1572

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN BULGARIA

Pact Initiatives

LD141700 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Jun 87

[Text] As we have already reported, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, will tour the socialist countries of southeast Europe. He will visit Bulgaria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Here is Boris Dmitriyevich Pyadyshev, first deputy chief of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

[Pyadyshev] The visit is beginning from a good position. Our relations with Bulgaria are developing very well, I would say. The unity of views and a close cooperation between the CPSU and the Bulgarian Communist Party, and confidence in political, economic, ideological, and cultural spheres are at their core. The Soviet-Bulgarian mechanism of contacts between allies operates effectively. Just recently, this May, here in Moscow a meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and Comrade Todor Zhivkov took place, and before that Comrade Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, visited the Soviet Union. This time the Soviet and Bulgarian ministers of foreign affairs will also have enough issues to discuss.

I must mention that this will be the first official foreign trip by the Soviet minister after the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states. Obviously, the course of the implementation of the Berlin accord will be examined and analyzed in specific terms during the forthcoming conversations between Comrade Shevardnadze and Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Yugoslav leaders.

We have not yet received any reply from the West to the proposals put forward by the conference of the Political Consultative Committee, including to such an important document as the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact. A question often arises in the West: What is the essence of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria? What is it that today draws our two countries together so much? Western specialists cannot truly grasp the phenomenon of Soviet-Bulgarian relations, even when they are inclined to evaluate events in an objective way. These relations are too rich in content, they are too deep and genuine to fit into the stereotypes of Western politicians, journalists, and scholars. We are confident that the visit by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze to Bulgaria at the invitation of the Bulgarian leadership will serve the further development of cooperation between our countries and between the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples.

Talks With Foreign Minister

LD151707 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 15 Jun 87

[Text] Sofia, June 15 TASS — Talks between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov were held in Sofia today.

The sides had a thorough exchange of opinions on a wide range of international problems and questions of bilateral relations.

Complete identity of views was confirmed in the assessment of the present-day situation in the world and conviction was expressed that the present-day international situation shows again that it is only advance toward a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world, creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security that can guarantee the survival of humanity.

The Bulgarian side expressed complete support for the Soviet Union's line at the talks with the United States in Geneva on nuclear and space arms.

Questions of security and cooperation in the European continent were thoroughly discussed. The course of the Vienna meeting of the participating countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was analysed. The sides emphasised the importance of opening large-scale talks for purposes of radical reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe with corresponding lowering of military expenditures.

The Soviet side proclaimed again a firm support for the proposals of Bulgaria and Romania aimed at creating a nuclear and chemical weapons free zone in the Balkans, the Soviet Union's readiness to give the necessary guarantees for non-emplacment and non-use of nuclear and chemical weapons in the zone. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 15 June reports on the talks and adds: "On behalf of the Soviet Government, Comrade Shevardnadze passed on to Petur Mladenov an invitation to go to the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit. The invitation was accepted with gratitude."]

Shevardnadze Criticizes NATO

LD152019 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 15 Jun 87

[Text] Sofia June 15 TASS — "The Warsaw Treaty countries have stated at the highest level of authority that they will not attack any state under any circumstances and will never be the first to use nuclear weapons," said Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

He was speaking at a dinner in Sofia given in his honor by Petur Mladenov, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The Soviet minister said that nothing had been heard in reply to that statement.

"This is understandable, for the doctrine of the Atlantic alliance does not stand an open comparison either from the point of view of its direction or as far as the nuclear element is concerned. NATO has not given up and does not want to give up the idea of a first nuclear strike," Eduard Shevardnadze went on to say.

"Bulgaria and Romania which make up the southern flank of the Warsaw Treaty are confronted by the countries that form the southern flank of NATO. But, whereas Bulgaria and Romania have no single foreign military base on their soil, not a single nuclear missile, not a single nuclear munition, NATO's southern flank is overloaded to a breaking point with U.S. bases and a massive number of nuclear weapons," Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized.

"(Moreover), both Bulgaria and Romania stand in favor of the establishment in the Balkans of a zone free from nuclear weapons. However, this idea is clearly not to the liking of those who are shaping NATO's policy and using the territory of other countries for nuclear depots. In the past this region was referred to as a 'Europe's powder cellar' -- and some are wishing to reserve it in the status of a nuclear depot now," observed the Soviet foreign affairs minister.

"It is easy to guess with whom and with what the sympathies of the Soviet Union and our entire community are. It is easy to realize what the socialist countries are working for, what they are striving for -- from nuclear weapon-free regions to a nuclear weapon-free world. We proposed to paint a big nuclear zero around this entire planet. We have done and will do as much as possible to make such perception of the future world a reality. But the U.S. is not prepared for such a solution.

"Then we proposed a zero-zero draw to the Americans and West Europeans -- on medium-range and shorter-range missiles. In politics, an agreed-upon draw is not something objectionable. And yet it took our Atlantic partners one and a half months to think it over and in the end, at another Reykjavik meeting, they consented to the two zeroes. But how diminished they are -- the much awaited symbols of the continent's liberation from nuclear missiles. They are, so to say, prickling zeroes bristling with nuclear warheads of Pershing-1A missiles owned by the United States and stationed in West Germany," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

"And still the ice is broken, as they say. Things are moving, the West's outright obstruction seems to be off at this stage. But is it entirely so? The Geneva negotiations and the decoding of the interpretations of the NATO decision (?by the) American side will demonstrate that," the Soviet minister said.

Mladenov on Warsaw Pact

LD152027 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 15 Jun 87

[Text] Sofia June 15 TASS -- "The consolidation and deepening of the European process is the main line of the concerted policy of the fraternal socialist countries," member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, foreign minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov said here today. He spoke at a dinner in honour of member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on an official friendly visit here.

"The recent conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states was a clear and convincing proof of the essence of their foreign policy course. It was not just a defensive doctrine, but a doctrine directed against war, a doctrine of averting nuclear catastrophe that was proclaimed for the first time in history," the foreign minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria said. "That doctrine stated clearer than ever that the arms race and confrontation is not our policy, that we look not for rivals, but for partners capable of soberly appraising the realities of the nuclear age, partners with whom the problems existing in the world can be openly and honestly discussed and resolved with duly taking into consideration each other's interests and gradually lowering the level of military confrontation."

He pointed to the need of upgrading the mechanism of foreign policy interaction of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries, of increasing their collective contribution to ridding humanity of nuclear menace, to humanisation of international relations.

"Our activity is wholly aimed at turning the Balkans into an area of peace, mutual understanding, goodneighborliness and cooperation, at creating a nuclear and chemical weapons free zone in the Balkans," Petur Mladenov said.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN HUNGARY

Talks With Foreign Minister

LD171450 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 17 Jun 87

[Text] Budapest, 17 Jun (TASS) -- Talks between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Peter Varkonyi, minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, opened in Budapest today.

The ministers conducted a detailed exchange of views on key aspects of world politics and main issues concerning Soviet-Hungarian relations.

The discussion focused on pivotal problems of the current times: removing the military threat, eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, strengthening European and global security, and developing and democratizing international cooperation.

It was stressed that reality of the present-day world calls for a principally new approach to conducting international affairs based on principles of shaping a non-nuclear, demilitarized, and nonviolent world. Both sides are convinced that the socialist countries' proposals on creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security based on nonmilitary guarantees is a good foundation for forming the new period of humanism through the efforts of all states.

Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the Hungarian foreign affairs minister on the state of affairs at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. Peter Varkonyi expressed support for the Soviet Union's position at these talks.

A thorough exchange of views was conducted on the theme of the pan-European process in connection with the Vienna meeting of CSCE participating states. The ministers stressed the importance of questions of security not being separated from others at this meeting, and of the disarmament talks being conducted with the participation of all European states without exception, including the neutral and nonaligned. They expressed support for the idea of holding a meeting of CSCE foreign affairs ministers.

The two sides expressed support for the invigoration of the work at the Vienna meeting, where both countries' delegations interact in the interests of the comprehensive development of the Helsinki process.

Varkonyi Speech at Dinner

FM181413 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by Hungarian Foreign Minister P. Varkonyi at 17 June Budapest dinner for Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze under the general heading: "On a Friendly Visit"]

[Text] P. Varkonyi gave a dinner in E.A. Shevardnadze's honor. Greeting the Soviet guest, he said, in particular:

We regard meetings and visits of Hungarian and Soviet leaders as a contribution to strengthening friendship between the Hungarian and Soviet peoples and to developing Hungarian-Soviet cooperation. Meetings between J. Kadar and M.S. Gorbachev are of outstanding significance in this.

The restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union is reflected not only in transformations inside the country but also in international relations. It is helping to enhance the Soviet Union's prestige in the world arena, to shape more efficient relations among the socialist community countries, and to strengthen the democratic foundations of interstate relations. M.S. Gorbachev's words about the inadmissibility of nuclear war and that security must be preserved at the lowest level of arms, as well as his appeal to broaden East-West dialogue, express the essence of Soviet foreign policy and accord with the basic requirements of world development. Hungary entirely agrees with that policy, is interested in its success, and wholly supports it.

For decade Hungarian foreign policy has proceeded from the need to develop East-West dialogue and cooperation. And when the overall international situation was becoming exacerbated and the voice of the forces of confrontation was louder than that of the forces conscious of their responsibility for the destiny of mankind, we strove for a dialogue and to remove contradictions through negotiation. In the interests of fulfilling the tasks set by the MSZMP, Hungarian diplomacy will continue to take an active part in realizing the socialist community's international initiatives and will use the available means and opportunities to achieve this end.

Today the Hungarian people are in the front ranks of fighters for social progress, in the family of the peoples building socialism. It is extremely important to us that for the first time in our history we have an ally who offers the Hungarian people disinterested cooperation promoting each other's well-being. The Soviet Union is an ally of the Hungarian working class and of the entire people, a friend who has given us disinterested assistance in defending the gains of social progress and strengthening our national independence.

The restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union helps us, too, and is a stimulus for accelerating Hungary's development and resolving the tasks facing the country. Economic and social reform signifying qualitative renewal is a decisive condition for implementing our program. In achieving these aims we attach great significance to utilizing the potential of Hungarian-Soviet cooperation. The all-around development of our economic ties is vitally important for Hungary. The chief task is to find new means and methods which will promote the achievement of still more efficient cooperation on the basis of unity of views and with due regard to fundamental interests.

The documents adopted at the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin convincingly demonstrate our countries' constructive foreign policy intentions. To achieve the goals before us, it is particularly important today to strengthen unity and improve cooperation between the USSR and Hungary.

Shevardnadze Dinner Speech

PM181305 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "On a Friendly Visit"]

[Text] Budapest, 17 Jun (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is in Hungary on an official friendly visit, made a speech today at a dinner given in his honor.

He said: Several days ago in the capital of the GDR, the city of Berlin, which is celebrating its 750th anniversary, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev, Janos Kadar, and other highest leaders of our parties and states, adopted decisions which in my view strengthen the foundations of the ancient but splendid edifice which is Europe.

Finding myself here in the very center of the continent, I consider it not out of place to say that a divided Europe arose as a result of an irreconcilable attitude to a different system on the part of those who today speculate on the consequences of their own policy. There is no disputing that in our common European home there remain dividing lines and barriers; however the need for them was caused by totally concrete reasons and circumstances.

There are, unfortunately, people who are pleased by the very fact of the existence of barriers, as an illustration of their own views. As is known, there are various kinds of neighbors. In some cases no fence is needed, as for example between Hungary and Austria, where there is not one on all of the roads which link them. In other cases a fence makes it possible to live normally, without aggravations and crises.

Barriers are overcome not by inciting speeches and melodramatic staged events at the Brandenburg Gate, but by concrete demonstrations of a desire to live in peace and goodneighborliness, and by showing of responsibility in approaches and restraint in actions. Barriers are removed by actions that benefit peace, security, and cooperation.

The most direct and realistic way to remove the various barriers which divide the European peoples today lies along the main route laid down by the Helsinki Final Act. Concrete and tangible steps in that direction can be made today at the Vienna meeting of representatives of states participating in the all-European conference.

There, in every basket, are the businesslike proposals of the socialist countries. And nobody is trying to claim that no problems at all remain. For example, in the humanitarian field: The solving of them will undoubtedly be promoted by the conference on humanitarian questions in Moscow in which all states involved in the Helsinki process and also nongovernmental organizations and groups involved in human rights and the economic and social rights of citizens, can take part.

We consider that the Hungarian proposals on creating an international center of folk art in Budapest and on increasing translations of works of literature which are published in the languages of small European states are in accord with the drawing together of European countries.

And why not hold an economic forum, as proposed by Czechoslovakia? The USSR and Hungary and other countries of the socialist community support this idea because such a forum is in the interests of a future united Europe and it will be a step toward it.

All these examples show the active role of the Hungarian People's Republic in everything that concerns the consolidation of peace, the development of cooperation, and the creation of trust between peoples. Indeed, Hungary is invariably involved in every noble initiative and in all collective efforts aimed at this goal.

Not by chance, the socialist states, the coauthors of the proposal on creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security, asked Hungary to pose this issue for discussion by the UN General Assembly. The voice of the Hungarian People's Republic is attentively listened to at the Geneva Disarmament Conference and at other international forums.

The course of the socialist countries of freeing Europe from nuclear weapons, eliminating chemical weapons on a global scale, and achieving military and political detente is well known.

Here in Budapest many steps have been taken across the lines of division in Europe. Let us refer to the 1969 Budapest Appeal of the Warsaw Pact member states, which was an important landmark on the way to Helsinki in 1975. Let us refer, too, to the program for reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, put forward here in 1986.

The problem of destroying and surmounting the walls of mistrust is, in the final analysis, the problem of real disarmament.

In a tournament of honor and dignity it is easier to win by acting with an open visor. We, the socialist countries, are indeed acting with an open visor. We have just published a document on the military doctrine of our alliance and are waiting for NATO's response to our proposal for it to be compared with the doctrine of the Atlantic bloc.

We are breaking down the walls of distrust with our proposals on the elimination of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles. Surely the double zero option, which has at last been adopted by the other alliance, too, is of benefit for a Europe without walls and barriers?

Surely our readiness to discuss the issues of tactical nuclear arms -- under the understanding, of course, that the result of such a discussion will be yet another, a third, zero -- will force one more breach in the wall of suspicion?

It will be a very good figure: three zeros for the benefit of a united Europe. This is also the view of our Hungarian friends, who are making a huge contribution to arranging pan-European cooperation.

A considerable part of that cooperation comes from Soviet-Hungarian relations. They are large-scale in character. But on both sides there is a feeling of dissatisfaction at how our links are operating, especially in the economic and scientific and technical spheres. This is healthy dissatisfaction, for both we and our Hungarian friends want them to become more effective and to provide greater returns. If there is understanding on this point, then there will also be inspiring results.

Budapest is a city of poets, but even they express themselves without metaphors when the conversation turns to preserving civilization and the life of mankind. Therefore I will end with the words of Gyula Illyes: "We must act now according to the dictates of our conscience. Not by repeating empty words and find phrases but with deeds." And this is how you and we act together.

Talks With Kadar

PM191055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Janos Kadar Receives USSR Foreign Minister"]

[Text] Budapest, 18 Jun -- J. Kadar, general secretary of the MSZMP, today received E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

E.A. Shevardnadze conveyed cordial greetings and good wishes to the Hungarian leader from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. For his part, J. Kadar asked for his best wishes to be conveyed to M.S. Gorbachev and the other Soviet leaders.

During the conversation, held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding, the participants spoke highly of the level of relations between the USSR and Hungary based on the fraternal alliance between the CPSU and the MSZMP.

The MSZMP leader described socialist Hungary's life and the way in which it is resolving socialist building tasks.

E.A. Shevardnadze gave a report on the Soviet people's implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions, the preparation for the approaching CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and the restructuring under way in the USSR.

J. Kadar noted that the MSZMP and the Hungarian people have been following the progress of restructuring with profound interest and sincere sympathy and welcome the transformations taking place in all areas of Soviet society's life.

During an exchange of opinions on international questions emphasis was placed on the need to further deepen cooperation between the USSR and Hungary and among all the fraternal countries in the struggle to remove the threat of nuclear war and to build a non-nuclear and demilitarized world free of violence. Special attention was paid to questions connected with the practical implementation of the foreign policy initiatives put forward at the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin aimed at resolving problems of concern to mankind and primarily at reducing military confrontation and strengthening security in Europe and throughout the world. As the conversation stressed, the first important step toward ridding the European continent of all means of mass destruction would be to sign an agreement on the complete elimination of medium-range nuclear missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

Note was made of the great significance of the Warsaw Pact states' proposal to the members of the North Atlantic Alliance to hold consultations aimed at comparing the two alliances' military doctrines and seeking ways to remove the mutual distrust and suspicion and reach a better understanding of each other's intentions.

J. Kadar emphasized that the Hungarian leadership and the country's entire population warmly support the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy, which is aimed at safeguarding peace and international security.

The meeting reaffirmed the unity of views and profound mutual trust traditionally inherent in relations between the CPSU and the MSZMP and the Soviet Union and Hungary.

On the same day E.A. Shevardnadze held a press conference for Hungarian and foreign journalists.

E.A. Shevardnadze delivered a report to a meeting of the a'tiv of party organizations of Soviet institutions in Hungary on the theme of the tasks facing Soviet foreign policy missions under conditions of restructuring.

Shevardnadze News Conference

LD181829 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 18 Jun 87

[Excerpt] We begin our foreign reports with the press conference held by Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze in Budapest. Istvan Kulcsar reports:

[Kulcsar] Hungarian and foreign journalists filled the refreshment lounge of the Hilton Hotel in Buda to be able to report to the world on Eduard Shevardnadze's press conference devoted to his talks in Budapest. In his introduction, the Soviet foreign minister said, among other things:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] We have been here for less than 2 days, but in this short time we have achieved solid political results. We had a warm meeting -- politically speaking -- with Janos Kadar who made a deep impression on us on this occasion, as he always does. We conducted a long and interesting discussion with Gyorgy Lazar, mainly about questions of economic cooperation. We held talks with my friend Peter Varkonyi, and although the time available to us was restricted we were able to survey the most important issues, and were able to coordinate the necessary questions where it was required. [end recording]

The Soviet foreign minister described the spirit of these exchanges of view in Budapest as friendly, open and comradely, and said he is very satisfied with them. At his talks here, the restructuring taking place in the USSR was mentioned, and our partners voiced their anxiety about the future of restructuring, added Shevardnadze. [sentence as heard]

We promised to fulfill our pledges and carry out the restructuring until its completion, he declared. He then listed the international political problems raised at his talks in Budapest. These were the Geneva talks between the USSR and United States on space and nuclear weapons; the Vienna follow-up conference; a ban on chemical weapons, and the establishment of a general security system.

The Soviet foreign minister then outlined in detail the Soviet stance on the elimination of European medium-range and strategic [as heard] and tactical missiles. In this context he positively appraised the decision reached recently by NATO at its foreign ministers' meeting in Reykjavik that agreed in principle to the double-zero option. But he called attention to the fact that the USSR categorically rejects the Western concept that would exclude from this agreement the Pershing-1A missiles that are in the hands of West Germany but are equipped with U.S. warheads.

At the end of his press conference the Soviet foreign minister returned once again to this question. He said there are still more serious obstacles in the way of an agreement in Geneva, but the most important of these is the aforementioned problem of Pershing-1 missiles. The U.S. stance on this question differs from the agreement reached in principle at the Gorbachev-Reagan meetin in Reykjavik, which is all the more sad as time is pressing the negotiating partners because of next year's U.S. presidential election campaign.

Later, in response to a question from the Hungarian Television correspondent, the Soviet foreign minister reaffirmed that if the two great powers succeed in reaching an agreement, overcoming the difficulties on the question of the European medium-range and shorter-range missiles, then there will be a realistic possibility of a meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan.

In response to a question from the Soviet television correspondent, Shevardnadze commented in a condemnatory manner on President Reagan's speech delivered a few days ago in West Berlin, stating that it is not proper for the leaders of the great powers to give instructions to the Germans, to two sovereign states, regarding where and how to constuct or demolish, or delineate their borders.

The Soviet foreign minister spoke in an optimistic vein about the working out of an international agreement banning chemical weapons and the prospects of the Vienna follow-up conference. He said that it is important that a mandate should be worked out there for the conference negotiating the European reduction of traditional weapons and that the neutral and nonaligned countries should also participate in the latter conference.

This was followed by a question from Hungarian radio:

[Begin recording] [unidentified correspondent] How would you define the characteristics of restructuring in Soviet foreign policy and diplomatic activity?

[Shevardnadze in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] Restructuring is the practical struggle for peace, to end the arms race, to eliminate the nuclear armory and chemical weapons. It is a practical struggle, with the participation of all our friends, for the creation of trust between nations, so that the Soviet Union and other countries will be able to realize their socioeconomic goals. [end recording]

MTI on News Conference

LD182033 Budapest MTI in English 1920 GMT 18 Jun 87

[Excerpt] Budapest, 18 Jun (MTI)--Eduard Shevardnadze held an international press conference in Budapest Thursday. Following the opening words of Jozsef Benyi, Hungarian deputy foreign minister, the head of Soviet diplomacy gave a brief statement in which he conveyed the friendly, fraternal greetings of the Soviet people and then summed up the experience of his visit to Hungary. He stressed that significant political results had come of his friendly, comradely talks with Hungarian leaders, held in an open atmosphere. His talks with Janos Kadar were very serious as regards political content, while in a useful exchange of views with Gyorgy Lazar, chairman of the Council of Ministers they had covered the subjects of advancing economic cooperation between the two countries, and with Foreign Minister Peter Varkonyi, had coordinated Hungarian and Soviet poitions on important issues of foreign policy.

Eduard Shevardnadze announced that his talks in Budapest were centered on the issues of transformation characterizing not only the Soviet Union, but the home policy life of other countries in the socialist community.

"During my talks in the Hungarian, and before that in the Hungarian capital city, I became convinced that if there is anything disquieting our partners then it is the fate of the transformation, the Soviet foreign minister pointed out. [no end quotes as received] They would like the changes that have begun in our country to continue, that we execute what we have resolved to do. We have made a promise that this will be so, and that we will meet the hopes.

Speaking on international issues Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out that following the meeting in Reykjavik of the NATO Council and the decisions taken there, opportunities for an agreement on the full elimination of medium-range and tactical missiles in Europe are more favourable. At the same time elements have appeared in the position of the United States and its NATO partners which seriously hinder the conclusion of such an agreement.

The foreign minister termed Washington's and Bonn's intentions regarding the Pershing 1A missiles in the Federal Republic of Germany, owned by the Bundeswehr and the nuclear warheads on them that are American owned as the major obstacle. He termed the intention of transferring the warheads from US to the FRG as unacceptable, for this would withdraw them from the influence of the planned Soviet-American agreement.

At the Soviet-United States talks in Geneva on the zero-zero option, problems have also come up, and must be solved before agreement can be reached. Among them Eduard Shevardnadze mentioned the American phase plan under which in the few years following the signing of the agreement the Soviet Union would continue dismantling and destroying its medium-range and tactical missiles while the weapons of the United States would still remain, with Washington applying the full mechanism of verifying the Soviet disarmament measures. In our opinion the disarmament must be begun on both sides and the verification must be used equally for the Soviet and American steps, said the Soviet foreign minister.

There are other elements in the behavior of the United States that call for caution and that are hindering progress, said Eduard Shevardnadze. He warned that the time factor plays a very important role in the coordination of disarmament measures. There is not much time left until the beginning of the American presidential election campaign, and therefore every single day and hour must be used to the utmost in the interests of concluding the agreement planned on as soon as possible.

In concluding his statement the Soviet foreign minister pointed out, the issue of the missiles is difficult and complicated. The outlines of the agreement are beginning to take shape, though not easily. There will be an agreement if both sides consistently keep to what was agreed in Reykjavik by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

Replying to questions from journalists Eduard Shevardnadze spoke of the fact that there are other forums of negotiation in addition to the Soviet-American talks in Geneva where there are opportunities for advance. There are realistic chances of agreement being reached on conventional arms limitation in Europe and on the banning of chemical weapons. The fulfillment of European arms limitation possibilities depends to a great extent on how the Vienna follow up meeting decides on the future of negotiations on arms limitation in Europe.

It is very important that the disarmament issues are not separated from the all-European process begun in Helsinki. For this reason the Soviet Union calls upon the neutral and nonaligned countries participating in the process not to remain in the background but to voice their views in the debate on arms limitation issues.

Budapest TV Interview

LD182025 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1835 GMT 18 Jun 87

["Panorama" program interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by television reporter Peter Horvath on Heroes Square; Shevardnadze speaks in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; date not specified--recorded]

[Excerpts] When my colleagues were informed about Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's program in Budapest, it seemed that an interview could be made between two wreath-layings. As things turned out, this amounted to 7 minutes; this is what Peter Horvath had on Heroes' Square.

[Horvath] Good morning. I work for Hungarian television. I saw the light-hearted conversation with your compatriots. We journalists only get snippets of what goes on at serious discussions. But on this occasion I would like to use the opportunity, while we cross the square for the next wreath-laying, to make a promenade interview. What is the aim of your current visit to Hungary?

[Shevardnadze] It is no secret. Everyone already knows it as my visit has been announced officially. This is my first official visit to Hungary as USSR foreign minister. Otherwise, this is not my first stay in Hungary. I have been here before; I have traveled throughout the country, participated in a great many interesting meetings, and I have many friends, personal friends, here.

I think that the talks, discussions with Hungarian comrades will take place in an atmosphere of traditional friendship and complete mutual understanding. Beyond this, there are also some problems, not bilateral in nature, which we must seriously discuss.

I am thinking here of questions relating to Europe, the all-European process, and the strengthening of our countries' security, but also of the preservation of world peace, the elimination of space. So there are numerous problems and we shall endeavor to thoroughly discuss all the issues mentioned.

[Horvath] With respect to more general international issues -- excuse me, I hope I did not interrupt you -- Hungarians and also the entire world follows with a great deal of attention any information on nuclear disarmament and the Geneva talks. I would mention here that President Reagan spoke fairly recently very optimistically, I could say, about the successful outcome of talks on the double-zero option. What is your view of the U.S. President's statement; do you think the obstacles in the way of a successful conclusion to the Geneva talks have been removed?

[Shevardnadze] You know, I would talk about this with cautious optimism, with very cautious optimism. It is true that as far as medium-range missiles and tactical-strategic [kharcaszi-hadaszati] missiles are concerned, the contours of an agreement are beginning to be sketched in. But there are serious obstacles, serious problems. Among these is the question of the Pershing-1A missiles stationed on the

territory of the FRG. This is a very serious obstacle and we still have to work very thoroughly in order to remove this obstacle, so we can withdraw the Pershings from Europe, including from the territory of the FRG.

[Horvath] I am a Hungarian journalist; I do not work for a Western television station, but I have a suspicion. Now that one can see a willingness on the part of the foreign ministers of the NATO countries and the Reagan administration to reach agreement, it can be expected that my Western colleagues will insist: Look, on this occasion we were prepared to reach agreement and now the Soviets are raising difficulties when they talk about the missiles stationed in the FRG.

[Shevardnadze] Well, the situation in connection with this is the following: There are international agreements banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Americans have no right to give nuclear warheads to the West Germans. And it follows that if they still do this then they are blatantly violating international treaties.

The same can be said about West Germany. They have no right to do this either, because it also applies to them. The treaty banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons is an international agreement. So we have every legal basis on which to demand liquidation of these categories of nuclear weapons, to eliminate them from all of Europe.

[Horvath] According to current practice, summit meetings are always preceded by a meeting of foreign ministers. When do you intend to meet your U.S. counterpart?

[Shevardnadze] I cannot yet give a precise date, but discussions on this question are under way. I also think that there is a need for a meeting at the foreign ministers' level, so that we can sum up the results achieved so far. But this can probably only take place after the conclusion of the current round of the Geneva talks. After the completion of the current round of the Geneva talks the foreign ministers will have to meet.

[Horvath] As far as the possibility of a summit meeting taking place at the end of the year or perhaps at the UN General Assembly is concerned -- are you optimistic or not?

[Shevardnadze] The answer to that is unambiguous: If we sign an agreement on medium-range -- and together with this -- on tactical-strategic missiles, and if certain other questions are also solved, then I think there will be a real possibility of a summit.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN YUGOSLAVIA

Report on Dizdarevic Speech

LD191815 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 19 Jun 87

["Speech by Raif Dizdarevic" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Belgrade June 19 TASS -- Yugoslavia attaches exceptional importance to the successful development of relations and all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union, it was stated today by Federal Secretary of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for Foreign Affairs Raif Dizdarevic at a dinner tonight in honour of Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

The situation in the world has hardly ever been as complex as now, he went on. It is the duty of all countries to act not by way of confrontation but on the basis of patient talks and cooperation. Together with other Nonaligned countries Yugoslavia comes out precisely for this. Peace, the settlement of crises on various continents can be achieved only if an end is put to aggressions and act of violence and to outside interference.

We attach special importance to general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, Raif Dizdarevic went on. We welcome your country's initiatives and appreciate the prominent role played by Mikhail Gorbachev in this. These proposals have done much to facilitate the commencement of constructive talks on nuclear disarmament. We hope that this process will be accompanied also by a reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe. I would like to especially note here that the Mediterranean Nonaligned countries, including Yugoslavia, hope that the process of reducing and eliminating nuclear arms and also of reducing conventional armaments will be spread in equal measure to the Mediterranean area as well.

Shevardnadze Speech

PM230919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline "Meeting in Belgrade" on speech by Eduard A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, minister of foreign affairs, at dinner in Belgrade on 19 June]

[Excerpts] In his speech in reply, after expressing gratitude for the kind and warm words addressed to the USSR and the Soviet leadership, E.A. Shevardnadze said: Today we are intently scrutinizing Yugoslavia's appearance and the faces

of its people. For, to use the words of Ivo Andric, you can see on people's faces "all the thoughts and deeds, all the desires and hopes, all the potential of the person, everything that supports and elevates him..."

We are glad that the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are actively cooperating in the international arena precisely as socialist countries.

We value highly your country's contribution to strengthening international peace and security. We have perceived with great satisfaction Yugoslavia's support for the Soviet approach to questions of disarmament and to the elimination of nuclear medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe.

We take careful account of our Yugoslav friends' opinion on the need to democratize international relations and create the conditions necessary for constant economic development of all countries of the world as the basis of strengthening their independence and freedom.

Both our countries attribute a great deal of importance to solving the problems linked with working out nonmilitary guarantees for ensuring security in a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. We interact closely in the UN, especially in connection with the discussion there on creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

The Soviet Union sees in Yugoslavia one of the recognized leaders of the Nonaligned Movement, and regards its activities in that movement with respect.

The Soviet Union welcomes the fact that the foreign policy tradition of the Nonaligned Movement -- a tradition of tireless activity for lowering tension, for implementing measures of military detente, and for strengthening confidence and cooperation -- can be traced more and more distinctly in Mediterranean affairs, in which Yugoslavia displays a completely understandable activeness. The Soviet Union shares the resolve of many states of the Mediterranean to ensure for their region a worthy place in the geography of a stable peace and goodneighborliness. We are prepared to support any practical steps in this direction. The situation arising in the Mediterranean must be in total accord with that lofty concept with which people rightly endow it with the title: cradle of many civilizations.

Talks With Mojsov

PN220138 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Visit to Yugoslavia"]

[Text] Belgrade, 20 Jun (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, who is on an official friendly visit to Yugoslavia, was today received by Lazar Mojsov, president of the SFRY Presidency.

In a conversation held in a warm and comradely atmosphere, the sides exchanged information about progress in the implementation of tasks to accelerate the social and economic development of the USSR and the SFRY in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 13th LCY Congress. Key questions of bilateral relations were

discussed. The sides stated with satisfaction that cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is developing dynamically on the basis of the principles enshrined in the principled accords between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Renovica and in joint documents and is becoming enriched with modern forms and new content.

A detailed exchange of views took place on current problems in international life. Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the Yugoslav leader in detail on the work of the session of the PCC Of the Warsaw Pact member states in Berlin and drew his attention to the document adopted there "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact Member States", which clearly reflects the defensive character.

Lazar Mojsov expressed Yugoslavia's support for the idea of creating an all-embracing system of international security and other large-scale initiatives of the Soviet Union. Eduard Shevardnadze rated highly the SFRY's efforts to ensure peace and cooperation. He stated that the Soviet Union is in favor of continued growth in the role played in world affairs by such an authoritative force as the Nonaligned Movement, in the establishment of which Yugoslavia played such a prominent part.

TANJUG Interview

LD211312 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0824 GMT 21 Jun 87

[Excerpts] Belgrade, 21 Jun (TANJUG)--"It is with great optimism that we look upon the prospects for the further development of Yugoslav-Soviet relations and cooperation. Both sides showed wisdom at the time by adopting solutions that enabled our countries to overcome the accumulated relics of the past and successfully develop mutual relations. Contacts between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are developing in a uniform, stable, and mutually beneficial fashion, based on the principles of equality and mutual respect."

This was stated by Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, in his interview to TANJUG, replying to a question on the prospects for relations between the two countries.

In reply to the question on the international situation, the Soviet foreign minister said that "the alarming picture of the world is not a result of natural disasters. All problems are a product of human hands and minds. It seems as if all this can be easily rectified. But this not the case. Time passes, problems are exacerbated. Why is it so? In our opinion, this is because politicians and the political elite approach the reality of the nuclear-space era and its terrifying and fantastic possibilities with ideas from the past century."

Shevardnadze spoke in favor of new thoughts, first and foremost of the need to comprehend the dangers connected with the very existence of nuclear weapons.

"We reached the conclusion in the Soviet Union that the interests of our national security require the renunciation of nuclear weapons. This is the point of departure of the program of general scrapping of nuclear weapons proposed by Gorbachev. The Soviet-U.S. summit in Iceland showed that a nuclear-free world was a realistic expectation."

"It is necessary to resolve the problem of security in such a world," said the Soviet minister. "We have proposed a concept that offers a solution. By this I mean the idea of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security. Its essence is a joint effort among states to work out a guarantee in support of peace. The basis -- tested and genuine -- exists. It is the UN."

"It is possible to formulate and work out a structure of security in a nuclear-free world only by the efforts of all states. Nonaligned countries, including Yugoslavia, could play a major role in this. I spoke about this with my colleague Raif Dizdarevic."

Dwelling on the topic on the activity of nonaligned countries, problems of development, and the securing of international political and economic relations on an equal footing, the USSR foreign minister said that the Nonaligned Movement can and should play the most active role in resolving important issues connected with security. In his opinion, the arms race is not the only illness of the modern world. For many people death from hunger, malnutrition, lack of necessary medical assistance, or pollution of the environment is closer than the one caused by nuclear weapons or even regional wars.

"It is harmful in every sense -- human, moral, and political -- to care only about those who are well-fed and healthy. Real security should provide adequate living conditions for every man.

"A question arises," said Shevardnadze, "as to how things should be done. An enormous amount of resources are necessary -- financial, intellectual, and others. Where to find them? We can have allocations from every possible source, but in the final analysis the necessary funds for development and resolving global problems can only be secured by reducing expenditure for military purposes.

"This is yet another argument in favor of the concept of creating a system of general security. In today's world everything is reciprocally linked and interdependent and a complex solution should be sought. All problems -- human rights, economic development, international relations on an equal footing, halting of the arms race -- can be resolved if the world is approached as one entity, a world in which the security and welfare of mankind are indivisible."

The following question referred to Soviet U.S. negotiations in Geneva and prospects for a Gorbachev-Reagan meeting.

Shevardnadze stressed that there was a positive element in the decisions of the NATO countries in Reykjavik, but that at the same time this was "a step sideways from those accords that began to emerge after the meeting between Gorbachev and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in Moscow.

"It is a question of trying to avoid, basically to step outside the framework of, a possible accord and to keep nuclear missiles, Pershing-1A's, in the FRG, more precisely their nuclear warheads, which belong to the United States and which are under its control. On our side, we are scrapping and destroying all the warheads of this range. The same should be done with U.S. nuclear missiles and warheads. It does not help to refer to the Pershing-1A missiles as being an alleged armament of a third party. If their nuclear warheads do not belong to the United States and if they are not under its control, then we have to deal with another matter: the violation of the accord on the part of the United States and the FRG on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

"This dilemma cannot continue: Either the Pershing-1A missiles are being used to block an accord on medium-range missiles, or a violation of the duties resulting from the 1963 accord is being concealed.

"We rightly expect," stressed Shevardnadze," that the United States will propose a denouncement that would allow a way out of the situation created by the recent decision of the NATO Council.

"There are still no grounds for talking about definite progress in the Geneva negotiations, though a certain step forward has been noticed.

"The logic behind this should be clear and understandable to everyone: If there is anything ambiguous from the point of view of possibilities of compromise in Geneva, it is equally uncertain that a summit will take place.

"If an agreement is reached, there will be a meeting. Without an agreement, it would be too early to say what to expect from the meeting."

At the end of the interview with TANJUG Eduard Shevardnadze expressed gratitude for his warm and cordial reception in Yugoslavia.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

EAST GERMAN DELEGATION DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES IN MOSCOW

TASS Report on Talks

PM241105 Moscow PRAVDA 23 Jun 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Talks in the Kremlin"]

[Excerpts] Talks were held in the Kremlin 23 June between N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.N. Slyunkov, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and A.K. Antonov and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; and a GDR party and government delegation consisting of G. Mi.tag, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee; W. Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; G. Kleiber, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; G. Shuerer, candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; and G. Ehrensperger and G. Beil, members of the SED Central Committee.

In the course of discussions of international questions, emphasis was placed on the fundamental importance of the initiatives put forward by the Berlin conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee for the fate of peace. Their implementation would make it possible to free Europe from nuclear weapons, reduce military confrontation, ensure better mutual understanding and consolidate trust, and contain the risk of a surprise attack. The document on military doctrine adopted in Berlin convincingly expresses the defensive nature of the military strategy of socialism.

The sides asserted that, in their proposals, the fraternal countries strove to take the positions of the United States and its allies into account as much as possible so as to accelerate the solution of problems perturbing the European peoples and ensure an improvement in the international situation. Hope was expressed that the West, for its part, will display readiness to move toward the other side's positions [gotovnost k vstrechnomu dvizheniyu].

The Soviet side noted the GDR active role in the cause of strengthening security and stability in the continent of Europe and the importance of its joint proposal with the CSSR to create a nuclear-free corridor and a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe.

The talks were held in a warm, comradely atmosphere and confirmed the complete unity of views on all the questions discussed and the desire to collaborate actively with the other socialist countries, including within the framework of the Warsaw Pact Organization and CEMA.

The GDR party and government delegation emphasized that, as a result of the USSR's flexible and constructive stance at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, a real opportunity is emerging to come to an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, which would make it possible to free the continent of Europe from this class of missiles and mark the beginning of the process of nuclear disarmament.

A joint working protocol on the results of the talks was signed.

The GDR party and government delegation visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum 23 June, and laid a wreath. A wreath was laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

ADN Report on Talks

LD231421 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1043 GMT 23 Jun 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, 23 Jun (ADN)--There were talks in the Kremlin today between the party and governmental delegation from the GDR consisting of Guenter Mittag, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee; Willi Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; Guenter Kleiber, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers and member of the SED Central Committee Politburo; Gerhard Schuerer, candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; as well as Guenter Ehrensperger and Gerhard Beil, members of the SED Central Committee; and Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Lev Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Nikolay Slyunkov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Nikolay Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; as well as Aleksey Antonov and Ivan Silayev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The basic significance of the constructive initiatives concerning the fate of the world which were proposed at the Berlin meeting of the political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states, was emphasized in a discussion of international questions. Realization of these initiatives would make it possible to free Europe from nuclear weapons, to reduce military confrontation, to create better mutual understanding, to strengthen trust, and to restrict the risk of a surprise attack. The document accepted in Berlin on military doctrine convincingly expressed the defensive nature of socialism's military strategy.

Both sides noticed that the fraternal countries went out of their way in their proposals to take into account the positions of the United States and its allies in order to hasten a solution to the questions that moved the peoples of Europe and to achieve an improvement in the international situation. The hope was expressed that the West would, for its part, show a readiness to be accommodating.

The Soviet side paid tribute to the active role of the GDR in strengthening security and stability on the European Continent and to the significance of the joint proposals by the GDR and the CSSR on the creation of a nuclear weapons-free corridor and a chemical weapons-free zone in central Europe.

The GDR party-government delegation stressed that real possibilities were opened up in the Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva, as a result of the flexible and constructive position of the USSR, for reaching agreement on medium-range missiles and on operational and tactical missiles which would make it possible to liberate the European Continent from this type of missile and to enter the process of nuclear disarmament.

The talks were held in a warm and comradely atmosphere. They emphasized the complete agreement of opinions on all the matters discussed and the efforts to actively work together with the other fraternal socialist countries within the framework of the Warsaw Pact organization and CEMA, among others.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES GREEK ENVOY, MESSAGE

LD241655 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 24 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received the Greek ambassador in the USSR Ioannis Grigoriadhis on the latter's request.

The ambassador presented a personal message from the Prime Minister of Greece Andreas Papandreou to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in reply to his message that was presented to the head of the Greek Government on May 14 in Athens by Mikhail Solomentsev. The message outlines the Greek position on a number of pressing international problems and also on questions of bilateral relations.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that much importance is attached in the Soviet Union to the existing practice of exchanging messages between the leaders of the two countries. The coincidence or closeness of the positions of the USSR and Greece on the fundamental problems of our time, first of all on questions of preserving peace and strengthening international security, is gratifying. We highly value the support given by the Greek Government to our proposals on the double zero option on Euromissiles and the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, as well as Andreas Papandreou's initiative concerning the creation in the Balkans of a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons, and the positive attitude of Greece to turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and cooperation. The Soviet side expressed readiness to further maintain contacts with Greece, including as with one of the active members of the "initiative of six", which is having a positive influence on the forming of a favourable political climate for advancing the process of disarmament.

Questions of relations between the USSR and Greece were discussed during the conversation. It was noted that on the whole they are on a high level, especially in the political field. Both sides expressed readiness to further intensify them.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

USSR: FURTHER ON DEBATE OVER DETERRENCE DOCTRINE

WA250605 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 19, 6 May 87 p 7

[Speech by Ales Adamovich (Belorussia) to USSR Writers Union Board of Directors Plenum]

[Text] I must make a clarification in connection with a part of Comrade Volkogonov's speech. He tactfully did not name me (I am affectionately grateful to him for this gesture), but I have nothing to hide.

To put it in professional language, what I slighted in my article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI (8 March 1987) was merely the doctrine of deterrence via the threat of retaliation, that is, the threat that if you annihilate me, I will annihilate you! But this was yesterday. Today it is: If you start something, everything living on earth will die. You saw on television how furiously Margaret Thatcher clings to this doctrine, as do all militarists in the West. But we reject the principle of a balance of terror and, what is most important, are submitting the boldest proposals one after the other if only for all of us to relinquish the riskiest balancing above the abyss. This is only because they could annihilate us and we in response would also have to wipe out a whole country -- everyone, both the innocent and the guilty. What is most terrifying is that an exchange of such a quantity of warheads that all other peoples and countries would be killed -- we would destroy everything living -- would be inevitable.

A "first strike," were it to happen, would mean thousands upon thousands of warheads, several per enemy missile silo. This would inevitably mean nuclear winter, as scientists have estimated. It would mean radiation (the more so if shattered nuclear Chernobyls are taken into consideration) from which even the aggressor country could not save itself. This is, they also would be condemned to an even more agonizing death. But most important of all -- everything living on earth would be doomed to destruction.

Here is the passage from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI:

"It could be intimidating also, the new thinking. This is no easy thing, thinking through to their conclusion thoughts of the thermonuclear age.

"I was having a conversation with the commander of a modern submarine.

""Are you not somewhat frightened to realize what cosmic power you have within reach?"

"Answer: 'Someone must have it, since it is there. One just has to keep oneself from unnecessary thoughts.'

"'But imagine,' I hastened to ascertain all at once, 'that those whose doctrine allows a nuclear first strike had launched one. Or an accident, a mistake, but half the world covered by a whirlwind of fire. And it was up to you whether to respond or not.'

"The women present at the table responded immediately:

"'Of course! They have hit us, they have wiped out everyone!'

"These hasty voices were from the last war, a prenuclear war.

"The master of the nuclear submarine, however, remained silent. Then he asked me:

"'Would you press it?'

"'I, no. The destroyers of mankind would then have achieved this through my hands. Through my second strike.'

"And, besides, I recalled and reminded them: Retribution would hit them all the same without a retaliatory strike -- in the form of lethal radiation from their own warheads to the bombed-out nuclear reactors.

"'I hold my peace, nonetheless,' the military man said, 'no one, they even less, must know how I would act.'

"We do not want to participate in the killing of mankind, to participate either in a first, second, or any other strike and it is for this reason that we support the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, are ready to and will with relief part with nuclear 'power,' we are not in the least gratified by cancerous pseudobiceps, we do not cling to nuclear power status -- all our proposals, moratoriums and practical steps to accommodate the other side speak for themselves."

So whom was the author of the article sparing? Surely not those who would attack his people? And not the remote Brazilian or Australian, the last on earth, perhaps, but, more precisely, homo sapiens, his human race!

There can be no winner in a nuclear war. This is an absolute truth of our time -- the very foundation of any realistic policy. A truth obligatory for military thinking -- the new thinking.

My submarine commander said: "I hold my peace, nonetheless, no one, they even less, must know how I would act."

That is, lest a possible aggressor, any nuclear idiot be tempted to escape retribution and sit out his own radiation, nuclear winter, and such in bunkers.

Although we understand this, we want everyone to understand it: There will be no successful waging of nuclear war. Whoever conducts it more "successfully" and launches more warheads will merely be making a bigger "contribution" to collective suicide. Such is the reality. Literature cannot and does not have the right to avoid pondering this. It should respond to its most accursed questions with works. But when I was suddenly and bluntly asked by the military man, I answered not only from the depths of my maddened consciousness, shaken by this inconceivable choice-question, but also from the depths of literature, in which Tolstoy, Dostoyevskiy and the great humanists of all times and peoples reside, and excuse me, there escapes from me this: "I would not press it!"

Suddenly somewhere, thanks to this, a pocket of life, not someone else's, ours, human life, would survive...!

Today is the anniversary of Chernobyl. It is not fortuitous that 26 April reminded many people who are somewhat older of 22 June. It truly ranked with it.

There was everything: wild, regrettable confusion, heroism and outright crimes. All this was and continues.

But literature views everything through the prism of psychology and morality, including Chernobyl.

What we need to rid ourselves of in the course of the restructuring is pseudopeople and pseudospecialists, from the "pseudo" in general. This phenomenon was conceived back in Stalin's time. Pseudoscientists, pseudocommunists and so on and so forth.

What is still occurring in the Belorussian soil and the Ukraine is preventing Chernobyl being put in the past. The situation still demands intervention, and that of writers first of all. If not we, who?

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

SOVIET ARMY POLITICAL CHIEF DECRIES 'UNDERTONES OF PACIFICISM'

WA251612 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 87 p 2

[TASS report: "Lecture Propaganda--Cause of the Party"]

[Excerpts] To proceed from real life and its problems, from the new situations developing in the process of restructuring--that is the area in which our country's lecturers and propagandists see their task. They strive to be active conveyors of the party's strategic course, by fundamentally changing the content, forms, and methods in their work. That was mentioned by the delegates to the Ninth Congress of the All-Union Znaniye [Knowledge] Society.

A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and the Navy, conveyed his heartfelt wishes of fruitful work to the congress delegates and to all the activists and members of the Znaniye Society. He emphasized the importance of joint collaboration in the area of patriotic-military education and the propagandizing of military knowledge.

Special attention in the statement was devoted to the formation of the ideological-political and moral awareness of the young people who are preparing for service in the Armed Forces. In this regard the speaker shared his concern that, recently, undertones of pacifism have begun to appear in certain statements. But the struggle for peace and pacifism are by no means one and the same thing.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

PRAVDA REBUTS CLAIMS OF SURVIVABILITY OF NUCLEAR WAR

PM180953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev dispatch: "Nuclear Catastrophe 'Optimists'"]

[Text] New York, Jun--The fact that a nuclear war would spell death for all mankind has become a kind of axiom for our age. This truth was particularly fleshed out after scientists in the Soviet Union and the United States independently arrived at the "nuclear winter" theory.

Having calculated all the necessary data by computer, they concluded that even a "limited nuclear exchange" between two countries would lead to smoke and dust clouds blacking out the sun and causing a sharp drop in temperature around the planet. And this, in addition to the colossal destruction and deaths of millions of people in the countries directly affected by the strike, would irreversibly disrupt life in all corners of the planet.

All would seem to be clear. And we must draw the corresponding conclusions from this. Nonetheless, even now various essays and reports appear in the West persuading people to think that nuclear war is survivable. True, hundreds of millions of people would die. But not all. Those who are well prepared may, it is claimed, survive. The latest example of this most dangerous kind of disinformation is a "research" work just published in Washington. It was published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency--a government body tasked with protecting and evacuating the population in the event of war.

The "wise men" at the federal agency concluded that losses among the U.S. civilian population would be somewhat smaller than they had originally thought. The areas which, in the opinion of the report compilers, would be targets for direct nuclear strikes--that is, the places where people would die immediately--are inhabited by "just" 112 million Americans (out of a total population of 242 million), and not by the 156 million they had assumed in 1957... Painting a "more hopeful" picture, the Pentagon hirelings proceed, as they put it, on the basis that the increased accuracy of Soviet missiles makes it possible to hit military targets with less powerful charges. The "research" work, naturally, says nothing about what those Americans who survive the outbreak of nuclear war could expect. Or about what kind of world would be left to mankind in general if the "fearless" logic of the compilers of such reports were to prevail.

The report in THE NEW YORK TIMES on the research was published under the headline "Survivability of Nuclear War: Mounting Optimism." Who needed this false optimism tantamount to criminal deception? You can find the answer to that question by looking at the Pentagon budget and the U.S. military-strategic plans, reports on which are reaching the press. Although recently the leaders of the U.S. Administration have started stating that a nuclear conflict is unwinnable, they continue to gamble on the use of nuclear weapons. Washington stubbornly refuses to join in the commitment made by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and the U.S. generals in NATO constantly state that they cannot have their "hands tied" by such a decision. Of the 312 billion dollars requested by the Pentagon for the fiscal 1988 budget, 73 billion are earmarked for preparations for nuclear war. The "fates" on the Potomac have insane scenarios for various types of nuclear war from "limited" through "prolonged" up their sleeves.

That is why today's Washington leaders embark on any agreements to limit the arms race so reluctantly under growing public pressure. That is why "optimistic" reports on nuclear war similar to those featured by THE NEW YORK TIMES are appearing in the United States.

As for our position on this most important of questions, it is wholly and clearly formulated in the corresponding document signed at the recent conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. "The military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact and of each of its participants," it notes, "is subordinated to the task of preventing war--both nuclear and conventional... A world war, especially if it were nuclear, would have catastrophic consequences not only for the countries directly involved in the conflict but for life itself on earth."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1559

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

August 24, 1987

D.S.